THOMAS Bels Motiues: CONCERNING ROMISH FAITH and Religion.

Exod. cap. 8. vers. 19. אצבעאלהים־הוא

Digitus Dei hic est

The second Edition:

Newly corrected and inlarged by the Author.

Trinted by Iohn Legate, prynter to the Vniuersity of Cambridge. 1605.

And are to be sold at the signe of the Crowne in Paules Church-yard.

67.1144

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

TO THE RIGHT Honourable my verie good Lordes, the Lordes of her Maiesties most honorable priuy COVNCELL.

IF Tertullian *(Right Honorable) erred montanizing, if* Cyprian *rebaptizing: if* Origen *corporizing: if Nazianzen angelizing, if* Eusebius *arrianizing: if* Hyeronimus *monogamizing: if* Ambrose *millenizing, if* S. Paul *gentilizing: if* Augustine *retracted many things: if* Aquinas, Navarrus, Victoria, *& many others best learned Papists, haue often changed their opinions, if all this I say be true, as true it is indeed: it will not I trust (for it cannot iustly I wot) be imputed as blame-worthy: that I vpon better aduise submit my selfe to my vndoubted Soveraign, most gracious and bountifull queen Elizabeth: that I recognize mine errors, that I reclaime my former vnsoundly conceited opinions, as best lerned writers haue done before me. Which alteration he hath mercifully wrought in me (*qui attinget a fine ad finem fortiter, & disponit omnia suauiter,*) Our mercifull God, I meane, who hath of late reuealed in time, that which in his eternall purpose, he ordained before the world was made. For our good God, who according to his common course of proceeding, directeth things inferiour by superior, and vseth humane meanes in producing visible external effects: first inclined my hart to peruse more seriously, some learned papistes before studied: and that done, to prouide and reuolue other most renowned Papists, which before I had neither read nor seene. By means whereof, God illuminating mine vnderstanding, I haue by little and little perceiued the popes owne doctors, to impugne his Romish religion, and so detested all popish faction. As who at this houre (god be* Sapient. 8. 1.

thanked) behold as in a glasse, the false, erroneous, and execrable doctrine of the Church of Rome. And because omne bonum est sui diffusivum, as sayth Areopagita: neither can I with safe conscience hide that light vnder a bushell, which God of his great mercye hath bestowed on me, no doubt as well for the benefite of others as of my selfe: I haue thought it worth the labour to set downe my chiefest motiues, by which and through which next vnder God, I was perswaded to renounce the Romish faith and religion: as who perswade my selfe constantly, that what soeuer Papist in the whole world shal with an indifferent iudgement peruse the same, hauing a resolued minde to embrace the truth when it appeareth: that selfe same Papist will vtterly renounce with me, the false, erroneous, and execrable doctrin of the Church of Rome. For I will proue the sayd Romish doctrine by Gods holy assistance, to be of such quality as is alreadye said; not onely by scriptures, authorities, and reasons, (though such proofes I purpose to vse:) but (which is most forceable against Papistes,) by the euident testimouies of best lerned Papists, & who are of best account: euen in the church of Rome. And consequently, that great learned men of all ages since popery began, yea in the very altitude of Popedome and in the Church of Rome: haue approued, holden and defended, weighty and important points of doctrin: contrary to the church of Rome. Which so soon as I vnderstood, my mind and will was by and by alienated from the Church of Rome. This rare methodicall discourse (my right honorable good Lordes all) as in which Papistry is effectually confuted and confounded by papistry it selfe: I haue presumed to dedicate vnto your Honors, for two especiall considerations. First, that so I might exhibite some signe of a gratefull & dutifull mind, for your Lordships most honorable countenances and great good wils towards me. Secondlie, because this my discourse, will not want many potent and mightie aduersaries; and so stand need of honourable wise, and graue Patrons, for the honest and lawfull approbation of the same. The Almighty grant vnto your Lordships many ioyfull and happy yeares, with much increase of zeale in true religion: to his eternall glorie, the faithfull seruice of her Maiesty, and the common good of our native countrey, Amen. From Cam. 3. Nov. 1593.

Dionys. Areopag. de diuin. nominib c 4.

Your Lordships in all dutifull manner,

THO: BELL.

ALbeit I will not now dispute, whether the Bishops of Rome bee that Antichrist, of whom the Apostle speaketh to the Thessalonians, or no? (notwithstanding the affirmatiue be the iudgement of sundry great learned men;) yet dare I, and do I boldly auouch, that Bishops of Rome haue for many yeares past, bene the precursors and fore-runners of that very Antichrist, whereof mention is already made: which to hold and thinke, many weighty and important reasons haue mooued me. For first, who but Antichrist, or his precursor, will either ascribe, or suffer to be ascribed vnto him: such power of maiestie, and title of Deitie, as are proper and peculiar to God alone? And yet is this to be verified of the Pope & vndoubtedly, by the Popes owne doctrine, and his Popish doctors. The Pope (if we will beleeue him) telleth vs: that God, when hee instituted two great lights in the firmament: to wit, the Sunne and the Moone: signified thereby, the autoritie of Popes and of Kinges: giuing vs to vnderstand, that the Pope is as far aboue a king in authoritie, as is the Sunne aboue the Moone in excellencie: yea, he addeth further; that Kings and Emperors, haue no power, to draw the sword against Popish Bishops and priests: as who forsooth, are not subiect to their iurisdiction. And least I should be thought, to father vntruthes vpon the Pope: I will (which is my woonted manner throughout my whole booke,) alledge his owne words, which are these: *Ad firmamentum cœli, hoc est, vniuersalis ecclesiæ, fecit Deus, duo magna luminaria, id est, duas instituit dignitates, quæ sunt, Pontificalis autoritas, & Regalis potestas: sed illa, quæ præest diebus, id est, spiritualibus, maior est: quæ verò carnalibus, minor: vt, quanta est inter solem & lunam, tanta inter Pontifices & Reges differentia cognoscatur.* To the firmament of heauen, that is, of the vniuersal church, GOD made two greate Lightes: to wit, hee ordained two greate dignities, which are the authoritye of the Pope, and the power of the King: but that power which ruleth spirituall thinges, is greater: and that which ruleth things carnall, is lesser: that so great difference may be knowne betweene Popes and kinges, as is betweene the Sun and the moone. The Popish glosse in the same place, setteth downe precisely, how farre the king is inferiour to the Pope, in these words: *Restat, vt Pontificalis dignitas quadragesies septies sit maior regali dignitate.* It therefore remaineth, that the pontificality of the Pope is seuen & four-

2 Thes. 2 v. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Greg. 9. lib. 1 decret. tit. 33 cap. 6.

Glossa ibid.

Greg. vbi supra.

fourtie times greater, then is the regallity of the king. Pope Gregorie saith further, in this expresse manner: *Intelligendum non est, quòd Rex vel Imperator super bonos & malos gladij acceperit potestatem: sed in eos solummodo, qui vtentes gladio eius sunt iurisdictioni commissi.* Wee must not vnderstand, that the King or Emperour hath receiued power of the sworde ouer the good and the euill: but only ouer them, who vsing the sword are committed to his iurisdiction. Beholde, how the scripture is tossed and wrested: to take from kinges, that power which God hath giuen them. The Popish parasites, the glossators of the Canons, ascribe more magnificall and plain diuine titles vnto the Pope: euen such as no way can be denied, to be proper and peculiar to God alone. These are their expresse words: *Sic (Papa) dicitur habere cœleste arbitrium, & ideò etiam naturam rerum immutat. substantialia vnius rei applicando alij: & de nihilo potest aliquid facere.* So the Pope is said to haue celestial arbitrement, and therfore doth he altar the nature of things, by application of the substantial parts of one thing to another: and he can make of nothing something. Thus verily doe they write, and yet no greater blasphemy can be vttered. Ioannes Gerson, though otherwise a great papist, maketh rehearsal of intollerable dignities, and titles ascribed to the pope: which notwithstanding the pope himselfe hath acknowledged as pertaining to him, but the said Gerson them reproueth and derideth. These be his expresse words: *Consurgit ex aduerso blandiens & subdola adulatio, et ad aures Ecclesiasticorum præcipuè summi Pontificis insurrans: ô quanta quanta est sublimitas ecclesiasticæ potestatis tuæ? quoniam sicut Christo collata est omnis potestas in cœlo & in terra, sic eam Christus omnem Petro suisque successoribus dereliquit. Vnde nec Constantinus quicquam Syluestro papæ contulit, quod non esset priùs suum: sed reddidit iniustè detētum. Porrò, sicut non est potestas nisi à Deo, sic nec aliqua temporalis vel ecclesiastica, imperialis, vel regalis, nisi a Papa: in cuius formore scripsit Christus, Rex regum, Dominus dominātium: de cuius potestate disputare, instar sacrilegij est: cui neque quisquam dicere potest, cur ita facis? mentior si non inueniantur hæc scripta, ab illis etiam qui sapientes sunt in oculis suis.* There starteth vp on the contrary side faire-spoken and crafty adulation: whispering in the eares of Clergy men, especially of the pope; Oh how great, how great is the Maiesty of thine Ecclesiasticall power? for as al power was giuen to Christ, in heauē and on earth: so Christ left all the same power, to Peter and his Successours. Wherefore the Emperour Constantine gaue nothing to Pope Syluester, which was not his owne before, but onely restored that, which was vniustly deteyned

Glossar. lib. 1 decretat tit. 7 cap. 3.

Gerson, de potestat. eccles consider. 12. part. 3.

from

from him. Further, as there is no power but of God, ſo is there neither any temporall or Eccleſiaſticall, Imperiall or Regall, but of the Pope: in whoſe thigh Chriſt hath written, the King of Kinges, and Lorde of Lords: of whoſe power to diſpute, is as meere ſacrileadge: to whom no man may ſay. Why doeſt thou ſo? I am a lyar, if theſe thinges be not written: euen of them, who are wiſe in their owne conceits. Theſe are Doctor Gerſons words: who though he were a great Papiſt, yet could hee not digeſt theſe Antichriſtian blaſphemies, neither hide or conceale them within his breaſt. Neuertheleſſe Pope Boniſacius did not only acknowledge them, but with great pleaſure practiſed the ſame, as witneſſeth the ſaid Gerſon in theſe words: *Hanc exiſtimationem habuiſſe, viſus eſt Boniſacius octauus in quadam decretali: putatur ab alijs depoſitio vnius Regis Francie per Papam Zachariam hic eſſe fundata: tanquam Papa ſit, qui tranſferre poſſit Reges & regna.* Pope Boniſacius the 8 of that name ſeemeth in a certaine decretall, to haue had this opinion of his own authoritie. Others think, that the depoſition of (Childericus) the French King by Pope Zacharias, was grounded in this (Antichriſtian & godles conceit:) as if forſooth the pope were he, that could depoſe princes, and tranſlate their kingdomes. And our Ieſuite Bellarminus, is ſo far from bluſhing at this moſt deteſtable fact of Pope Zacharie: that he yeeldeth the reaſon *ſi dijs placet*, for the iuſtification thereof. *Childericum (inquit) depoſuit Papa, & in eius locum Pipinum Caroli magni patrem Regem creari iuſſit: cuius cauſa fuit, quia propter ſocordiam Childerici, et Religioni, et Regno in Gallia, extrema ruina imminere videbatur.* The Pope (ſaith our Ieſuite) depoſed Childericus, and commanded to place Pipinus father to Charles the great, in his throne. The cauſe whereof was this: becauſe forſooth through the negligent gouernment of Childericus, the Kingdome and Religion of France, ſeemed to be in great danger. Thus ſaith the Popes vaſſal; out of whoſe words I gather firſt, that ſo much may be truely verified of Popes, as Gerſon hath avouched.

Gerſon ubi ſupra.

Bellarminus de Rom. pont. lib. 5. cap. 8

I gather ſecondly, that the Pope challengeth both ſwords, and him ſelfe to be not only vniuerſall biſhop, but vniuerſall king alſo ouer all the world.

I gather thirdly, that the Ieſuites (howſoeuer they diſſemble by their fondly imagined æquiuocation) thinke of our moſt gratious ſoueraigne Queene Elizabeth, and meane to doe with her moſt excellent Maieſtie, as the pope thought and did with Childericus: and for that end *ſaltem ſecundario*, are ſo many Ieſuites ſent ſeditiouſly into this land. Se-

Secondly, my L. Abbot their owne deare Bernard, saw in his time such tyranne and Antichristian dealing in the Church of Rome, as hee was thereby and therewith enforced to exclaime in these words: *Tempus faciendi nunc, quia dissipauerunt legem, bestia illa de Apocalipsi, cui datum est os loquens blasphemias, & bellum gerere cum Sanctis, Petri Cathedram occupat, tanquam Leo paratus ad prædam.* It is now high time to do good, for they haue troden vnder foote Gods lawe. That beast mentioned in the Reuelation, to whom was giuen a mouth speaking blasphemies, and to make wars with the saints: sitteth in the chayre of Peter, as a Lyon ready to take his prey.

Bernar. ad Gaufridum, epist. 125

Thirdly, the pope doth not only take vpon him, to depose kinges and Emperours himselfe, but he avoucheth further, that subiects may and are bounden to depose their dread Soueraignes, whensoeuer they decline to infidelity: which certes is by Popish interpretation, when any king or Queene embraceth sincerely the holy Gospell of Christ, and denyeth Romish popery. For thus writeth *Bellarminus*, whose doctrine the Pope hath lately approued. *At si isti idem principes conantur auertere populum à fide, omnium consensu possunt & debent priuari suo dominio.* But if these Princes go about to auert the people from the faith (of the church of Rome:) then by the consent of all, they maye and must be dispossessed, of their Scepters and regalities.

Bellar. lib. 5. de Rom. pont. cap. 7

Againe, in the second Chapter he saith thus: *Quod si Christiani olim non deposuerunt Neronem, & Diocletianum, & Iulianum apostatam, ac Valentem Arianum, & similes; id fuit, quia deerant vires temporales Christianis.* If the Christians in times past, deposed not Nero, Diocletian, Iulian, Valens, and such like Emperors; the cause thereof was, for that they wanted power and force, and were not strong enough for that attempt.

Bellarm. cod. cap.

Againe, a little after he hath these wordes: *At non tenentur Christiani, immò nec debent cùm euidenti periculo religionis, tolerare Regem infidelem.* But Christians are not bound to tollerate a king, that is an Infidell (or not a papist) nay, they must not tollerate such a one, with the euident danger of Religion. And our said Iesuite yeeldeth this reason hereof, because forsooth saith he, *De iure humano est, quòd hunc aut illum habeamus Regem.* For it is by the law of man, that wee haue this or that man to our king. This is the doctrine of our popes, and lately hatched Iesuites: out of which most disloyall and vnchristian assertion;

Bellarm. cap. eod.

Bellar. ubi supra.

I infer first, that the pope and Iesuites would most willingly depriue our most gratious soueraign of her royall throne and Regallity; if they were of force and power so to doe.

I inferre ſecondly, that our Ieſuit doth here aproue peremptorily.

Firſt, the diabolicall excommunication of Pope Pius.

Secondly, the diſloyall fact of Murton, who brought the ſame into this Realme.

Thirdly, the publiſhing thereof by Felton.

Fourthly, the practiſing of the curſe by Sanders, Fitz-morice, Ballard, and other their ſeditious complices.

Fiftly the renewing of the print, and diſperſing of the copies in Rõe, by our Ieſuits, Perſons, and Campion; as a compendious preparatiue, for their commodious entrance into this land.

I inferre thirdly, that all ſubiects are by this doctrine ſtirred vp and encouraged to manifeſt rebellion; & to haue no ſcruple of conſcience therein. The reaſon hereof is euident, becauſe if kinges receiue their authority from man, as this Ieſuite auoucheth: then may kings indeed be diſplaced by man, as Romiſh paraſites, and irreligious politiks bear the world in hand: yet Salomon the wiſe repleniſhed with holy inſpiration, teacheth vs another doctrine: *Per me inquit, regis regnant, & legum conditores iuſta decernunt, per me principes imperant, et potentes decernunt iuſtitiam.* By me (ſaith God in Salomon) kings reigne, and princes decree iuſtice. By me princes rule, and all nobles, and iudges of the earth. Prou.c.8.15

And the apoſtle ſaith: *Omnis anima poteſtatibus ſublimioribus ſubdita ſit: non eſt enim poteſtas niſi a Deo.* Let euery ſoule be ſubiect to higher powers: for there is no power but of God. Roman.13,1

But hereof more at large, in the ſixte chapter and third concluſion of the ſecond booke. Fourthly, Syluester Pryeras that great popiſh Thomiſt, telleth vs roundly and malepertly: that Empires and regalities are not from God immediately, but from God by meanes of the pope. And he ſaith further, that royall power is ſo ſubordinate to poperie, or papacie: as is the moone vnto the ſunne. These are his owne words: *Nec obſtat, quod poteſtas imperialis eſt a deo conceſſa ſecundum multa iura: quia eſt a deo, mediante papa: quia eam concedit non vt homo, ſed vt vicarius Dei. Nec ſunt ſic diſtincta poteſtates, ſpiritualis ſcilicet & temporalis: quin vna alteri ſubalterentur, ad inſtar lunæ & ſolis: nec ſunt diſtincta, quaſi ſemper ſint in diuerſis: ſed quia ſunt ordinatæ ad diſtincta, ſcilicet ſpiritualia & temporalia: & in vno eodemq; ſummo pontifice eſt vtraque in ſummo.* Syluest.de papa.par.2. It skilleth not, that many lawes affirme imperiall power to bee of God. For it is from God, the Pope being the meane, who granteth it not as man, but as the vicar of God. Neither are the two powers, (the ſpirituall and the temporall,) ſo diſtincte: but that they remaine ſub-

ordinate the one to the other, after the reſemblaunce of the ſunne and moone: neither are they diſtinct as being alwaies in diuerſe ſubiectes, but as ordained to diſtinct thinges, ſpirituall and temporall. For they both are in one and the ſelfe ſame pope, euen in the higheſt degree. Fiftly, ſuch as is the ruler of the cittie, (ſaith Bellarminus our Ieſuite) ſuch are the inhabitantes thereof: but Pope Boniface the eight entred into his popedome as a Foxe, reigned in it as a Woolfe, and died out of it like a dogge, as I haue prooued in my 2. booke, in the 3. chapter and ſecond concluſion: *ergo* all the cittizens of Rome in his time began as foxes, continued as wolues, and ended their daies as dogs: and conſequently, the whole Church of Rome during the time of Pope Boniface: was wicked, diabolicall, and meere antichriſtian. What ſhall I ſay of kiſsing the Popes foote? of bearing the Pope vpon mens ſhoulders? of the Popes diſpenſing with the lawe humaine, the lawe of nature, and the lawe diuine? theſe may ſuffice, to teach vs to walke warilye, to looke about vs with all circumſpection, to bee verie carefull what doctrine wee embrace: and euer to ſet before our eies, the admonitions and premonitions of our ſauior Ieſus Chriſt. *Attendite, inquit Dominus, a fermento Phariſæorum quod eſt hypocriſis.* Beware ſaith our Lord, of the leuen of the Phariſes, that is, their falſe doctrine, infected and infatuated with the traditions of men: as it is expounded in another place of the goſpell. We muſt therefore here obſerue, that in the ſcribes and phariſes reſted in thoſe daies the ordinarie externall face, power, regiment, and iuriſdiction of the church. For ſo ſaith our Sauiour, in another place of the goſpell: *In cathedra Moſis ſedent Scribæ & Phariſæi: omnia ergo quæcunque præceperint vobis ſeruare, ſeruate et facite.* The Scribes and Phariſes ſit in the chaire of Moſes: therefore, whatſoeuer they ſhall command you to keep, that keep and do. Wherefore ſince our Lord commandeth vs, to beware of the hypocriticall doctrine of the Phariſes, who had the primacie in the viſible Church of that age: and ſince Chriſt commanded this for no other end, but becauſe they had corrupted the ſacred and pure word of God, with the mixture of their own fooliſh traditions: for that Chriſt obiected againſt them, ſaiing: *Quare & vos tranſgredimini mandatum Dei, propter traditionem veſtrã:* why do you tranſgreſſe gods commandement, for the accompliſhmẽt of your own tradition? & in another place: μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων: But in vain do they worſhip mee, teaching doctrines the commandements of men: ſince I ſay, our ſauiour thus commandeth

Bella. de rom pontif. lib. 5 cap 7.

Luk. 12, 2

Mat. 16, 13

Matth. 23, 3

Mat. 15, 3.

Mat. 15, 9.

mandeth vs: it followeth, that we must refuse, reiect, and contemne, all prelates, all Bishops, all priests, and all whosoeuer haue any administration in the church, by what name or title soeuer they be called: if they deliuer to vs the worde of God impurely, or mixed with traditions of men: and consequently, that we must reiect and renounce, the pope, & all the rable of popish cleargie-men: as who doe either not deliuer the word of God at all, or at least so mingled, so pestered, so corrupted, so adulterated with mans traditions: as no part thereof remaineth sound, pure, and intire. It then standeth vs vpō, to imploy our whole care, studie, and industry, that we may liue secure from the leuen of these Phariſes, that is, of these popes & popish vassals: who insteed of christiā doct. do hypocritically deliuer vnto vs, yea with threat of fire and faggot inforce vpon vs, the present poyson of our soules. For if he that sitteth in Peters chaire be Antichrist, as witnesseth their owne Bernard: if the bishoppes of Rome hath written in their thighes, the king of kings and Lord of Lordes, as their Gerson auoucheth: if all power as well ciuill as ecclesiasticall be challenged of Popes, as their Syluester affirmeth: if popes can place and displace kinges and Emperours, and dispossesse them of their regalities, and royal seates, as their Iesuite Bellarmine boasteth: if the bishoppes of Rome be as farre aboue kings in authoritie, as the Sunne aboue the Moone in excellencie, as Pope Gregorie teacheth: if no king can draw his sword against any of his subiects, being clergie-men without the popes good license and fauor, as the said Gregory telleth vs: if the pope be taken to be greater then any king by seuen and forty fold, as the popish glosse proclaimeth, nay, if the pope apply the substantiall parts of one subiect to another: if the pope take vpon him to make of nothing something, as affirmeth another glosse: then doubtles doeth it necessarily follow, that if the Pope be not that Antichrist, whereof S. Paul speaketh to the Thessalonians: yet is he perforce that Antichrist, whereof S. Iohn writeth in these words: *Omnis spiritus qui soluit Iesum, ex Deo non est: & hic est Antichristus, de quo audistis quoniam venit, et iam in mundo est.* Euerie spirit that dissolueth Iesus, is not of God: and this is *A*ntichrist, of whome you haue heard, that he is alreadie come, and is euen now in the worlde. For not onely they dissolue Iesus, that denie his dignitie or his humanitie, or the hypostaticall vnion of the same, but they also that derogate in any point frō the office, auctority, and power of Christ, (who is our eternall king, our head, our prophet, our priest:) and in like manner, all they that by any meanes 1 Iohn 4, 3

depreſſe or obſcure the ſame: as do the papiſts, in innumerable particulars: to wit, in their reall inherent iuſtice, in their condigne merites of workes, in their congruent diſpoſitions, in their maſsing ſacrifice, in their carnal preſence, in their accidents without ſubiects, in their lordly papall primacie, in their purgatory-purifications, in their ſatisfactorie ſupplements, in their diſholy ſupererogations, in their phariſaical flagellations: and in many other like ſuperſtitions, fondly reputed holines, theſe things are partly proued already: but more fully and exactly, throughout the whole diſcourſe following: peruſe therefore gentle reader willingly, marke it attentiuely, iudge of it friendly, condēn nothing raſhly, reuolue the authorities ſeriouſly, approoue the trueth conſtantly, reiect faſhood zeaouſly; and if thou ſhalt perceiue thy ſelfe to reape any ſpirituall commodity by this my labour: then vouchſafe to commende me in thy hearty praiers, to the father of all mercie: to whom with the ſonne and the holy ghoſt, be all honour, power, glory, and dominion, now and euermore, Amen.

The Preface ſpeciall, to the ſimply ſeduced Papiſts.

LIke as the ſoule ſurmounteth the body, in originall dignity: ſo do the diſeaſes of the ſoule exceed the diſeaſes of the body, in al impiety. And conſequently, greater conſideration ought to be had in prouiding remedies for the ſoule, then for the bodye. Neuertheleſſe ſo it is, that none will or can indeed prouide a remedy for that ſore, wherof he hath no feeling or intelligence at al. In regard whereof, eſpecially becauſe papiſtry is of Papiſts reputed no diſeaſe or ſore, I haue imployed that ſmall talent which God of his meere mercy hath beſtowed on me, to the end that al Papiſts who ſhal ſeriouſly peruſe this my briefe diſcourſe, may with all facility perceiue ſuch to bee grieuous diſeaſes of the ſoule, as heretofore they deemed to bee none. But as they that are ignorant of their diſeaſe, neyther do nor can prouide a ſoueraigne remedy for the ſame: in like maner, neither can they at any time be perfectly cured, who though they know both the diſeaſe and the medicine for the ſame, yet will they not apply that medicine vnto their ſore. Euen ſo in the ſubiect matter: that papiſt who wil not once read this ſhort

volume, which vnfoldeth the abhomination and manifolde deformities of popery, and that by moſt liuely and euident demonſtration, deduced out of the bowels of popery it ſelfe: muſt perforce ſtill remaine in the agony of his ſaid diſeaſe. Againe, if any Papiſt ſhall reade it, but with a reſolued mind to contradict it, and ſo either raſhly to contemn it, or without iuſt tryall to diſcredit it: Such a Papiſt (as many I feare will be founde by ſiniſter perſwaſion of ſeditious ſeminaries) cannot for want of due application, attain the expected effect otherwiſe correſpondent thereunto. And that thou beloued Papiſt whoſoeuer thou art, mayſt with more alacrity read this little booke; I do aſſure thee, that my proceeding in the diſcouery of popiſh ſuperſtitions, vanities, enormities, falſhods, diſſentions, errours, hereſies, and blaſphemies, is ſuch and ſo ſincere; as vppon a *ſalvo conducto* (as they terme it) granted from any king chriſtian, & licenſe procured of my gratious Soueraigne, I am and will bee moſt willing, to repaire into any prouince in Chriſtendome; there to giue an account, and to make triall of the ſame. Lette therefore no popiſh cenſurers, comminations, or excommunications, terrifie thee from beholding the dangerous wounds of thy ſoule. Let no wilfull conceit ſo take place in thine heart, as thou wilt raſhly condemn it, before thou make due trial there of. Cal to mind for Ieſus Chriſt his ſake, and for the ſaluation of thine owne ſoule, that thou art not this day more zealouſly affected to popery then I my ſelfe was of late yeares. Adde herunto, that the perfect knowledge of Popery which I haue attayned by Gods grace and painfull ſtudy, hath ſo liuely ſet before mine eies the Popiſh enormities, ſuperſtitions, abſurdities, errors, impieties and blaſphemies; as vpon the due conſideration thereof, I could not but loth, deteſt and abhor al Papiſtry, and ſtand at open defiance with the ſame. Eſpecialy, becauſe at length I perfitly vnderſtood, that Papiſtry in al ages, had Ciuill warres againſt it ſelfe. Which thing is made ſo cleer and manifeſt by this little book, as more ſhal not need be wiſhed. I haue charitably and faithfully penned it, principally and chiefly for thy ſake.

And I nothing doubt but through the power of God, it will ſo ſufficiently perſwade thee, to vſe the ordinary means of thy ſaluation: that is, humbly to read the holy ſcriptures, which hath nor heretofore bin thy cuſtome, dilligently to frequent godlie ſermons, which are now common in this Realme, God be thanked: and often to confer with zealous preachers, for thy better inſtruction and ſound confirmation, as thou wilt ſhortly bee a greater enemy to popery, then thou waſt before a friend thereunto. For in this ſmall volume thou ſhalt perceiue euidentlie, that not onely popiſh monks, fryers and Ieſuites, but alſo theyr ſchoolmen, their Summiſts, their Canoniſts, their Thomiſts, their Scotiſts, their Abbots, their Biſhops, their Archbiſhops, their Cardinals, yea, and their greateſt popes themſelues, haue all in their domeſticall diſſentions and ciuill warres, ſo battered and made equall with the ground, the bulwarkes of their poperie, as no forraine enemy ſhall henceforth need, either to ſtand in feare of their fortreſſes, or to make aſſaults againſt the ſame. So ſurceaſing to ſpeake of their muttering vpon beades, theyr prayers in ſtrange tongues, their conſecration of bels, churches altars, chalices, patines, corporals, copes, veſtments, albes, girdles, tunicles, cheſibles, miters: their exorciſmes or incantations ouer oyles, chriſmes, aſhes, palmes, candles, ſalte, water, bread, their ſacrifiſing upon ſuch altars, in ſuch Churches, before ſuch relikes; to which their ſacrifices ſuch ſanctimony & merits are aſcribed, as that ſeminary is deemed beſt diſpoſed for Engliſh long intended inuaſion; who hath occupied himſelfe moſt buſily, in that their ſuperſtitious kind of doting: theirreſeruations of their bread-gods, often putrified, and now & then of Myſe deuoured: their idolatricall adoration of relikes, eſpecially of their ſo tearmed *vultus ſanctus*: ſurceaſing I ſay, from ſpeaking of theſe and like popiſh deliraments, and inſtantly wiſhing thy Chriſtian conuerſion in Chriſt Ieſus, I bid thee hartily farewell.

The names of the auncient Writers and holy fathers alledged in the Treatiſe following.

Dionyſius Areopagita.
Irenæus.
Tertullianus.
Origenes.
Cyprianus.
Iuſtinus.
Lactantius.
Athanaſius.
Hilarius.
Euſebius Cæſarienſis.
Baſilius.
Ambroſius.
Hieronymus:
Auguſtinus.
Chryſoſtomus.
Beda.
Euthymius.
Ruffinus.
Platina.

The names of Popiſh writers alledged in this volume, who all are of great eſtimation amongſt the Papiſts, and highly renowmed in the church of Rome.

Popes, or Biſhops of Rome.

Clemens.
Gregorius Magnus.
Adrianus.
Innocentius.

Cardinals, to the Popes or Biſhops of Rome.

Caietanus.
Turrecremata.

Theſe were popiſh archbiſhops of great learning.

Antoninus.
Panormitanus.

Popiſh biſhops excellently wel learned.

Ioannes Roffenſes.
Ambrosius Catharinus.
Melchior Canus,

Popiſh Abbots.

Rupertus.
Bernardus.

Popiſh Canoniſts.

Gratianus.
Angelus.
Navarrus.
Couarruvias.

Popiſh ſummiſts.

Sylueſter.
Fumus.

Theſe were popiſh monkes or popiſh friers.

Alphonſus.
Victoria.
Dionyſ. Carth.
Carranza.
Ioſeph. Ang.
Bellarminus.

Popiſh ſchoolmen.

Lombardus.
Albertus.
Alenſis.
Richardus.

Bona-

Bonauentura.
Aquinas.
Durandus.
Dom. Soto.
Paludanus.
Mayro.

Popish writers, who though they were not equall in dignitie, yet not inferiour in learning to the rest.

Lyranus.
Gerſonus.
Almaynus.
Cuſanus.
Abulenſis.
Viguerius.
Snoygoudanus.
Burgenſis.
Ben. Arias.
Matthias Thoring.
Ioan de Combis.
Bryto.

Theſe were popish Synodes.

Conc. Conſtantino politanum. 6.
Conc Conſtantinop. 8.
Conc. Baſilienſe.
Conc. Lateranenſe. 1.
Conc. Later. 2.
Conc. Tridentinum.

Catholike Councels.

Concilium Nicænum.
Conc. Chalcedonenſe.

Popish conſtitutions, or bookes equall with popiſh ſynodes.

Decreta.
Decretalia.
Liber Sextus.
Miſſale Romanum.

Popish commentaries of great accompt in the Romiſh church.

Gloſſa decretalium.
Gloſſa decretorum.
Gloſſa ordinaria.
Gloſſa interlinialis.

THE FIRST BOOKE CONTAINING CERtaine Preambles for the better ſatiſfaction of the ſimplie ſeduced Papiſts; as alſo that the Motyues in the other booke following may be read with greater profit.

The firſt Preamble.

IN the church of Rome for many yeares togither, were learned and godly Biſhops, who liued orderly, preached the worde of God ſincerely, and fed their flocke carefully; but in ſucceſſe of time by little and little the Romiſhe biſhops did degenerate from the godly life and holy doctrine of their auncеſtors, and became Wolues vnto their flockes, tyrants vnto the world. This is proued at large by the teſtimonies of approued Popiſh doctors, in the ſeconde booke and third chapter in the 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. concluſions. The great popiſh Schoolman and Spaniſh Frier *Victoria*, writeth in this manner; by little and little, not all at once, we were brought to this inordinate courſe, and to this ſo miſerable ſtate, that now we are neither able to endure our griefes, nor ſuch remedies as the church of Rome aſſigneth for the ſame. But if we had this day ſuch good Biſhops or popes as *Clemens*, *Lynus* and *Syluеſter* were, then might we commit al things ſafely vnto them: but alaſſe to ſay the beſt of them, becauſe I would not willinglie reproue them, the Popes now are farre inferiors to the auncient Biſhops of Rome. Reade *Victoria* his owne wordes, in the fourth concluſion of the fift chap. in which, the reader ſhal find much other worthy matter to the like effect; as that the diſſolute practiſe of the church of Rome is now ſo intollerable, that the worlde is not able to indure it; that not only the ſimple ſort, but euen the beſt of al are greatly ſcandalized therewith; that none ſeeke for diſpenſations, whether it be for marriages, or for irregularities, or for ſpiritual benefices, but they roundly obtain their ſutes; that not ſo many keepe the law, as are diſpenſed to breake the lawe: Adde hereunto the ſeauenth Preamble for more perſpicuity.

Loe, the miſerable eſtate which the church now endureth, begun by litle & little through naughty Biſh. of Rome.

The second Preamble.

Behold here the begining of Poperie.

BLinde Bayards, that neither had any thing neither knew any thing, desirous to speake placentia, & to flatter the Popes for their own preferment, began to write glosses vpon the Popish law, and therein to ascribe lordlie and more than royall tytles to the Pope: so doubtlesse saith their religious Frier *Victoria*. Read his words in the 6. cap. and third conclusion. So then through ignorance and pouertye, our holie father aspired to his tyrannie.

The third Preamble.

THe Pope hath no power coactiue ouer any King, but is the Emperours subiect, and oweth him obedience: Pope Gregorie surnamed the great, doth confesse no lesse, read the sixt chapter.

The fourth Preamble.

POpe Iohn was inforced to recant his false doctrine, before the king and the learned at Paris. Read the third chapter, and the fift conclusion: Ergo Peters saith failed in the Pope.

The fift Preamble.

This only testimony is able to confound all Papists.

THe Pope in S. *Cyprians* time, was esteemed but as a fellowe and companion to other bishops: for which cause S. *Cyprian* contemned his opinion, and reiected his determination, thogh set down by the consent of a prouinciall councell: which doubtles S. Cyprian would neuer haue done, if he had acknowledged or granted any such authority to the Pope, as the Pope this day challengeth to himselfe. Nay S. Cyprian thought himselfe euery way the Popes equall, and the African councell to be of as good authority, as the Italian or Romishe Synode, and therfore reproued the Pope verie sharplie, both of pride and Ignorance. Read the third chapter and last conclusion.

The sixt Preamble.

ALl the Apostles had not onlie the same power and auctoritie, but iurisdiction also, as wholie, largelie, effectually, and in al respects as Peter had. Read the sixt chapter and first conclusion.

The seuenth Preamble.

POpish Purgatorie was inuented by Popes & popish parasites, neither was it euer admitted, liked, or beleeued of the Greek church vnto this day. Read the 7. chap. and 2. conclusion. And here I will alledge the very words of our *Roffensis*, some time bish. of Rochester, a man so renowmed not in England onlie, but throughout the worlde amongst Papists, as his words may carry credite sufficient with them. Thus he writeth, I will not change one word. *Sed*

Sed & græcis ad hunc vsque diē, non est creditum purgatorij esse. legat qui velit Græcorum veterum commentarios, & nullum quantum opinor, aut quam rarissimum de purgatorio sermonem inveniet: sed neque latini simul omnes at sensim, huius rei veritatem conceperunt. & paulo post; *non absque maxima sancti spiritus dispensatione factum est, quod post tot annorum curricula purgatorij fides, & indulgentiarum vsus ab Orthodoxis generatim sit receptus, quandiu nulla fuerat de purgatorio cura, nemo quæsivit indulgentias. nam ex illo pendet omnis indulgentiarum existimatio. si tollas purgatorium, quorsum indulgētiis opus erit? his enim si nullum fuerit purgatorium, nihil indigebimus. contemplantes igitur aliquandiu purgatorium incognitum fuisse, deinde quibusdam pedetentim, partim ex revelationibus, partim ex scripturis fuisse creditum, atque ita tandem generatim eius fidem ab orthodoxa ecclesia fuisse receptissimam, facillime rationem aliquam indulgentiarum intelligimus. quum itaque purgatorium tam sero cognitum ac receptum ecclesiæ fuerit vniuersæ, quis iam de indulgentiis mirari potest, quod in principio nascentis ecclesiæ nullus fuerat earum vsus? cæperunt igitur indulgentiæ, postquam ad purgatorij cruciatus aliquandiu trepidatum erat.*

Roffens. cont. asserti. Luther art. 18. prope initium.

The Greekes to this day, do not beleeue that there is a purgatorie. Read who will the commentaries of the ancient Grecians, and he shal find either very seldome mention of Purgatorie, or none at all: for neither did the Latin church conceiue the veritie of this matter at one time, but by leisure, neither was it done without the great dispensation of the holy ghost, that after so many yeares Catholikes both beleeued purgatorie, and receiued the vse of pardons generally: so long as there was no care of Purgatorie, no man sought for pardons; for of it dependeth all the estimation that we haue of Pardons. If thou take away Purgatorie, to what end shall we neede Pardons? for if there be no Purgatorie, we shall need no Pardons: considering therefore how long Purgatorie was knowne, then that it was beleeued of some by little and little, partlie by reuelations, and partly by the scriptures, & so at the last beleeued generally of the whole church, we do easily vnderstand the cause of Pardons. Since therefore Purgatorie was so late lie knowne and receiued of the vniuersal church, who can now admire Pardons, that there was no vse of them in the Primitiue church. Pardons therefore began after the people stood in some feare of Purgatorie. These are the words of this popish bishop; which wordes, if they be well marked with al the circumstances, are able without more ado, to perswade any man to detest the Romish religion, for which cause I haue alledged them at large.

Not *Ireneus*, not *Iustinus*, not *Gregorius* not *Chrysost.* nor anye other father in the Greeke church, did admit popish purgatorie, as their owne deare popish bishop confesseth.

1 First, therefore we learne heere, that the Greeke church neuer beleeued Purgatory to this day.

2 Secondly, that the Latine church and church of Rome did not beleeue the said Purgatory, for many hundred yeares after S. Peters death, whose successour the Pope boasteth himselfe to be.

3 Thirdly, that this Purgatory was not beleeued of all the Latine church at one and the same time, but by little and little; where note by the way, that Poperie crept into the church by litle and little & not al at once, which point galleth the Papists, more then a little I weene.

4 Fourthlie, that Purgatory was beleeued in the latter daies, by speciall reuelation of the holy ghost.

5 Fiftlie, that Pardons came not vp till Purgatorie was found out: for in Purgatory resteth the life of Pardons, as which there beeing no purgatorie, are not worth a straw.

6 Sixtly, that Purgatorie was a long time vnknowne.

7 Seuenthly, that Purgatorie could not be found in the scriptures, of a long time.

8 Eightlie, that it was not wholie found out by the scriptures, but partlie by reuelations.

9 Ninthlie, that Pardons were not heard of or knowen to the primitiue church.

10 Tenthlie, that then pardons began when men began to feare the paines of Purgatorie.

Behold now gentle Reader, what a worthy fisher was my Popish Lord of Rochester? he hath caught with his Net at one draught tenne goodlie Fishes: that is to saie, ten worthy obseruations for Christian ædification. Further then this, out of the seuenth and eight obseruations, I gather three speciall documents by a necessarie and irrefragable consecution. First, that the second booke of the Machabees is not Canonicall, or penned by the Holie ghost. For if that booke were of canonicall authoritie with the Papists, purgatorie could not haue been knowne, so soone as that booke was known, which yet *Roffensis* denieth. The reason is euident, because Purgatorie is very effectually and plainly contained therein.

Secondlie, that the church of Rome (for of that church speaketh the Bishop) reputeth the workes of God vnperfect, albeit Moses auouch-
Deut. cap. 35. verf. 4. eth the contrarie. *Dei, inquit, perfecta sunt opera.* The workes of God, saith he, are perfect. I proue this, because as the Bishop saith, the scriptures

tures made Purgatorie knowne to the church, but vnperfectlie: yet the truth is, that if God make Purgatorie known by the scriptures, the purgatorie is made knowne perfectlie by them, or else Gods workes that is, the holy scriptures must be vnperfect. But I will rather belieue Moses the holy Prophet of God, then my lord our fisher, though the Popes canonized Martyr.

Thirdly, this Bishop for this his doctrine, must either come againe to retract his opinion, or else wil he nil hee, condemne the Pope and church of Rome. This I wil proue by a plaine and euident demonstration. For the better vnderstanding whereof, I shal desire thee Gentle reader to obserue three thinges with me.

First, that the church of *Rome* preacheth now and did in this Byshops time, that the bookes of Maccabees are canonical Scripture, & penned by the Holy-ghost.

Secondly, that the church of *Rome* neither belieued nor knew purgatorie for many yeares togither, after the receite of holy Scripture, & these bookes of Machabees.

Thirdlie, that Purgatorie is effectually and plainlie conteined in the second booke of Machabees by popish estimation, in that their Latine vulgata edition, which their tridentine councel hath most straightlie charged al Christendome to obserue, as al Papists nowe adaies repute the same a stable bulwarke for their Purgatorie: The words are these; *sancta ergo & salubris est cogitatio pro defunctis exorare, vt à peccatis solvantur*: It is therfore a good and godly consideration to pray for the dead, that they may be cleansed from their sinnes. These words are so plaine and easie, as not only the whole church, but my lord Bishop, yea and euerie scholler that but meanlie knoweth the Latin toong, must needs vnderstand the same; and consequentlie must needes know Purgatorie by them, if he can vse any discourse at all, as my Lord of Rochester could doe right well. Vpon these obseruations then I infer first, that the church of Rome not knowing Purgatorie for many years, after she had receiued the scriptures, in which Purgatorie was so plainlie and effectuallie conteined as they now grant, did not repute the Bookes of Machabees for Canonicall scriptures, and consequentlie did not beleeue Purgatorie mentioned therein. For this indeed is most true, of the old and good church of Rome, as *Roffensis* hath proued against his will. I infer secondlie, that the church of God neuer had or can haue other scriptures, or other faith, then the Apostles had and beleeued in

2 Mach. cap. 12, vers. 26

their time. For the latter church neuer had nor euer shall haue authoritie, to coine any new scriptures, or new faith. The church of Rome therefore taught most wicked doctrine in my L. Bishops time, which he well perceiued and acknowledged in his owne conscience, or else was in that point infatuated and become a verie foole, according to this saying of the Gospell,

Mat.ca.11. vers.25 *Confiteor tibi pater domine cœli & terræ, quia abscondisti hæc à sapientibus & prudentibus, & reuelasti ea parvulis,*

I giue thee thankes, O Father, Lord of Heauen and Earth, because thou hast hid these thinges from the wise and men of vnderstandinge, and reuealed them vnto Babes.

The 8. Preamble.

ALbeit the Papists doe reproue others bitterlie, when they reiect some authorities, though vpon important and groûded reasons, yet themselues with all libertie reiect and contemn authorities at their pleasures. They reiect the fourth book of Esdras as Bellarminus cõfesseth. They reiect the last clause of the Lords prayer, as *Arius Montanus* witnesseth. They reiect the 65. Canon of the apostles, as graunteth Bellarminus in these words: *Respondeo canonem istum suppositium videri solum n. quinquaginta canones apostolorum ecclesia recipit*. I answere, that this canon is a counterfait, for the churche (of Rome) receiueth only 50. canons of the apostles. Marke (gentle Reader) that this Canon reproueth the practise of the church of Rome, and so the church, *si dijs placet*, will not receiue it. They reiect the sixt generall Councell, because forsooth it prescribeth limits to the bishop of Rome, and denieth his vsurped iurisdiction. That they reiect this solemn and vniuersall Councell, Bellarminus aucucheth stoutlie: but pope Adrian reputed a most graue writer by the learned Papists, receiued and reuerenced the said Councell; these are his words, cited in their owne canon law: *Sextam synodum sanctam cum omnibus canonibus suis recipio.* I receiue the sixt holy Synode, with all the canons thereof. Loe, the Pope himselfe and their owne Canon law, confirme this councel to be of good authoritie. Read the next chapter in the said canon lawe, for there is a large matter vttered for the approbation of the same. They reiect that part of the Councell of Constance, which Pope Martin woulde not allow. And why would not he allow that part, aswell as he approued the other parts? because forsooth it denieth the Popes authoritie, to be aboue the Councell: but because I will not rip vp popish licenti-

Bellar.lib.1 de verb.dei.ca.4.

Aries Mont. in cap.6.Mat.

Bellar.lib.2 de Rom.pont.cap. 27.

Bellar.vbi sup.

Dist.16.ca.6.

Bellar.lib.2 de Concil.cap.19.

ous

ous liberty to the bottome, I will reſt with recitall of that only liberty, which Bellarminus vſeth in defence of popiſhe Maſſe: theſe are his wordes; *Porro epiſtolæ duæ quæ circumferuntur de hac re, Damaſi ad Hieronymum & Hieronymi ad Damaſum, ſuppoſititiæ ſunt.* Furthermore the twoe epiſtles which are carried about, of Damaſus to Hierome, and of Hierom to Damaſus, are counterfait. But the abſurdeſt Epiſtles, Canons, and writings that euer were or can be, are verie authenticall with thē, and moſt currant, ſo they make for our holie father the pope his vſurped iuriſdiction. For proſe of this point, I will content my ſelfe with two examples for brevitie ſake. For by them and the diſproſe therof, the Reader may haue a ſufficient coniecture of the reſt. The former example is taken out of S. Clements epiſtle to S. Iames. In this & the other epiſtles following put forth in the name of S. Clement, is commended vnto vs, auricular confeſſion, the ſacrifice of the maſſe, the ſubiection of kings to biſh. the primacie of S. Peter, & ſuch like: for which reſpects the ſaid epiſtles are currant and authenticall amongſt the Papiſts: but *Magna eſt veritas & prævalet*, great is the truth and it preuaileth, for the very words of the epiſtle betray and bewray the ſame, & make it manifeſt vnto the world, that it is a counterfait. Theſe therefore are the words: *Clemens Iacobo domino, epiſcopo epiſcoporum regenti hebræorum ſanctam eccleſiam Hieroſolymis, ſed & omnes eccleſias quæ vbique dei prouidētia fundatæ ſunt, cum patribus & diaconibus, & cæteris omnibus patribus, pax tibi ſit ſemper.* Clement to lord Iames the biſh. of biſhops, that gouerneth the holy church of the Hebrews at Hieruſalem, as alſo that gouerneth al churches founded by Gods prouidence throughout the world, with the fathers and deacons, and al other fathers, peace be to thee alway. Now gentle Reader thou haſt heard the words, and ſo beholdeſt no doubt the vanitie thereof: for if S. Iames were not onely biſh. of Hieruſalem, but the biſh. of biſhops, and the gouernor of all churches in the chriſtian world, as this epiſtle affirmeth; then doubtles was S. Iames the pope and ſupreme hed of the church & not S Peter; and yet doth the ſelfſame epiſt. auouch, that S. Peter was the head of the church, and that S. Peter lying ſick in his bed, called S. Clemēt to him, and told him that his houre of death was at hand, & that therfore he appointed the ſaid Clement to be his ſucceſſour, and to ſit in his chaire at Rome. But S. Iames ſucceeded Chriſt himſelfe at Ieruſalē, who was indeed the head of holy church: and therefore S. Iames ſhould rather be Pope then S. Clement, if there were indeed any ſuch

Bellar. lib. 2 de Miſſa cap. 16.

Epiſt. 1. Clemētis ad Iacobum fratrem dom. 1 concil.

3. Eſd. cap. 4 verſ. 42.

Pope

Pope at all: the latter example is taken out of that worke which is fathered vpon S. Augustine, of true and false repentance: which booke, because it seemeth to approue confession of sinnes to Priests, is good and authenticall with Papists; but as God would haue it, the selfesame booke confuteth it selfe so plainlie, as none with reason can esteeme it worth a straw. For in that verie booke the author therof (whosoeuer he were) alledgeth S. Austens opinion, and confuteth the same. These are the words: *Quod quamvis licet de eius salute Augustinus potuit dubitare, credo quidem illi qui dixit; quacunque hora peccator ingemuerit, & conuersus fuerit, vita viuit.* Because although S. Augustine doubted of his saluation, yet do I beleeue him that saide; At what houre soeuer a sinner shall repent and be conuerted, he shall liue. These are the wordes of the writer, which doubtlesse cannot be S. Augustin, because S. Austē would neuer speake of himselfe as of a strange third person, and purposelie confute himselfe, as this author confuteth Augustine. Besides this, S. Augustine in his bookes of confession doth vtterlie condemne confession of sinnes vnto Priests, as I haue proued in the chapter of auricular confession: but alas, the Papistes as they haue but one onely place of the Machabees for their forged Purgatorie, so haue they but onlie this place of S. Augustine for their popish confession. And therfore no maruel if they invent poore and miserable shifts to haue them both reputed authenticall, if it would be.

Aug. de ver. & fal. panit. c. 17

Ezech. 33

The 9. Preamble.

THe chiefest and principall thing that seduceth and maketh so many wilfull Papists, is this (gentle Reader) for certentie. Whensoeuer anie one of what degree, calling, or condition soeuer, shal becom a Papist, and yeilde himselfe to the slauedome of popish religion, that person must by and by professe *Ipso facto*, to beleeue and embrace all the popes decrees of faith and manners, as the verie selfe decrees of the holye ghost, and also to obey his ordinances and censures, as the lawes of God and not of man: the reason whereof is, because as they say, the Holy-ghost doth so direct, conduct, and guide the Popes tong and pen, that he can neither define, commaund, or write any thing in iudiciall and difinitiue manner, but it must perforce proceed from the Holy-ghost: out of which falslie supposed ground, two most pernicious euils follow of necessitie. The one, that whensoeuer any difficultie, doubt, or controuersie ariseth about any matter of religion, then by and by the Papistes consider first of all what the Pope holdeth (whether

this is a point wel worthy the obseruation

ther it be in the decrees, decretals, the sixt booke, Clementines, extrauagants) and that done, they wil coine one distictiō or other by which they will rack the meaning of the question, difficulty, reason, father, or scripture propounded, to agree with that which the pope holdeth. For they will neuer examine the popes decrees by the Scriptures, fathers or coūsels: but the fathers, or counsels, & scriptures, by the popes faith, constitutions, & practise. For if any can once say, the Churche, that is, the pope holdeth so, then is the controuersie at an end, he shal be deemed an hereticke that proceedeth one iot further. For their canon law hath made it sacriledge, to dispute of the Popes power. Read the first chapter, the other, that none may or dare read, either the scriptures translated into their vulgar tongue, or any expositors vpon the latine Bible, or any booke of controuersies, or any writer whosoeuer in any matter of Religion, popish writers onely excepted, vnles they first haue a licence from the Pope: which licence is neuer graunted, but to speciall persons & vpon special considerations. And out of this sharpe, vnchristian, and diabolicall prohibition, issueth the third euill; to wit, that not one papist among ten thousand knoweth any thinge pertaining to religion, saue onely a few speciall pointes of popish doctrin. For they are taught, that to beleeue as the fable of the Colier techeth them, is sufficient: the deuill as cardinall Hosius reporteth, disputed with a poor Colier, asking him how he beleeued, said he, as the Church beleeueth: then the deuill demaunded how the Church beleeued, the Colier answered in this maner: I beleeue as the Church beleeueth, and the church beleeueth as I beleeue, & there he rested, and would not remoue one iot. At the same stay are papists this day, who beleeue as the Church of Rome beleeueth, thogh they cannot tel how it beleeueth, but onely in a generall and grosse maner, and so they oftimes beleeue they know not what. Marry our Eugliſh papists fearing the statute, dare not stand on this beleefe, (though it be their stay indeed,) but flee to another bulwark as they deeme it, to wit, it is against my conscience, when yet indeed, they can no more tell what conscience is, then they know what the Romish Church beleeueth,

See the 13. article of discention, ca. 8 & the words of Couarruias in the 5. chap. & first conclusion.

He iumpeth with the churches faith, and yet knowes not what it holdeth.

The 10. Preamble.

THe religion this day established by godly laws in this realm of England, is the auncīēt, christian, catholike, and apostolike doctrine, which was taught by Christ his apostles, practised in the primitiue church, and euer continued in the hearts of the faithfull vntill this

houre, and shall no doubt to the worlds end. And though the cõmon people for the greater part, call it the new religion: yet is that a meer childish vanitie, & the popish doctrine the new religion in very deed. For the olde Romish religion, is this day holden and obserued in this Realme, which thing is proued at large, throughout my second book; for example, the profession of the Romish Capuchenes is not a newe profession in religion, but the olde franciscan profession newly reformed: and therefore doe they terme themselues the reformed franciscanes, which yet the other corrupt, and dissolute franciscans will not acknowledge, and euen so in our case, the religion now established in England, is not a religion opposite to the first olde Romish religion, but the old Romish religion newlie refourmed, and purged from the corruptions and abuses crept into the same. From which auncient and pure religion the pope and his adherents are departed, like as the franciscans are also gone from their old popish franciscan profession.

These Capuchenes are yet in Rome.

The 11. *Preamble.*

THe ignorant papistes (that is, all papistes or verie fewe excepted) doe greatly loath and abhorre the christian catholike religion, now established in this land by godly lawes in a godly manner. And this they doe vpon a ground falsly so supposed, by reason of their ignorance therein, their falsly conceiued ground is, that our religion contemneth good woorks, and iustifieth the most wicked liuers vpon earth: which if it were as they imagine, then were it indeede a greate motiue to dislike of our religion. But gentle reader, it is a most notorious slaunder doubtles, as I shall euidently prooue vnto thee. Hieronymus Zanchius writeth thus: *Primi affectus regenerationis ac spiritus, sunt amor iustitiæ, legisque, diuinæ, & odium peccati:* The first affects or fruits of regeneration and of the spirit, are loue of iustice, and of the law diuine and hatred of sin. and a litle after he saith thus: *Filij Dei & diligunt & faciunt iustitiam filij autem diaboli, & amant & faciunt peccatum.* The children of God both loue and do iustice, but the childrē of the diuel both loue and do sin, and again, *Manifestum sit studium bonorum operum effectum esse predestinationis:* It is manifest, that study to liue wel, & to do good works is the effect of predestinatiō: and an hundred such like places the same author hath, which I let passe for breuity sake, neither doeth any other of the learned amongst vs: hold contrarie to this doctrine. Nay all the pulpits god be thanked, sound out and extol the praise of good works, yea which is more to be admired of the papists, who think so basely of

Zanch. de natur. dei lib. 5. cap. 2. part. 2. q. 6.

our

our religion, we affirme the good works of the regenerate to be so acceptable in Gods sight, that he wil not suffer the least therof to be vnrewarded. & further we teach & affirm in our religion, that the regenerate & childrē of god can not continue in gods fauor, vnles they detest sin, striue against the concupiscence of the flesh, and doe good works. Yet further we auouch constantly, that none can beleeu truly in Christ, which doth not loue Christ, & which doth not imploy his whole care study, and industry, to do the will of Christ, and to keep his commandements. And that this is the faith and doctrine of the church of England, very many god be thanked for it, haue left to their posterity liuly testimonies of the same: wherof I only wil name one, who as he did inwardly in his heart beleeue the gospell, so did he outwardly in his life professe it, and after his death confirme the same, whith a most charitable and christian testimony of immortall memmorie. I speake of that honorable and zealous Christian S. Walt. Mildmay, the late foūder of a most famous colledge in the vniuersity of Cambridge, which he tearmed not after his owne name (as the greater part vseth) but Emanuell; that is, God with vs · giuing vs to vnderstand thereby, that as he beleeued and loued God, so he would testifie the same to al posterities by that worthy act as by the effect and fruit of a liuely faith. Now then how doe we differ from the Papists herein? *Zanchius* shall answer. *Atque hic est vnus ex præcipuis vsibus bonorum operum, quod iis nō tanquam salutis causis, sed tanquam effectis predestinationis & fidei, tum nos, tum proximi, certiores simus nostræ electionis, eoque & salutis.* And this is one of the chiefest vses of good workes, that both we and our neighbors are assured by them of our election and saluation, not as by the causes of saluation, but as by the effectes of predestination and faith. But the papists will say: If good works cannot merite glorye nor iustifie: wherefore then must we doe them? I answer, that we must liue well & do good workes, for the loue and dutie we owe to God, and because so is his holy will & good pleasure: so saith the Apost. in these words; *Ipsius enim sumus factura, creati in Christo Iesu in operibus bonis, quæ præparauit Deus vt in illis ambulemus*. For we are his workemanship created in Christ Iesus vnto good workes, which God hath ordained that wee should walke in them: so then we thinke as reuerentlie and esteeme as worthily of good works, as doth any papist in the world: for wee grant that none can be saued or sanctified without good works; and further, that none is truly iustified which hath not good woorkes; and

Zanch. vbi supra.

yet for all that doe we constantly affirme, and that by the authoritie of holie writte, that no man is or can be iustified, by vertue of his good works: & the error of the Papists consisteth in this, that they doe not distinguish betweene sanctification and iustification. The trueth of our doctrine (which is the veritie grounded in the sacred scripturs) is this, that sanctificatiō & iustificatiō, are inseperably vnited in one & the sāe subiect, *in eodē instāti tēporis nō natura*, as the schools speak, that is, we are freely iustified and sanctified also in the same instant of time, but first iustified in prioritie of nature: for example, fire and the heate are both at one and the same time, though fire be before in prioritie of nature: that is, though fire go before: as the cause of euerie thing is before the effect of the same; and as fire is not before heat in time, & yet the cause of that heat, so is our iustification not before our sanctification, or our inherent iustice in time, and yet is it the cause of our sanctification, of our inherent iustice, and of all the good works we do: which thing if the Papists would once seriously obserue, they woulde not differ from our opinion in this behalfe, vnlesse they haue fully resolued to oppose themselues desperately against the trueth.

The 12. Preamble.

WHo soeuer wil but euen superficially consider the vncertainty of popish doctrine, shal thereby without further discourse find sufficient matter to abhor and detest the same, as most friuilous, most ridiculous, most irreligious. For example, in the sacrament of the altar as they terme it: if certaine questions be propounded vnto them, the best learned know not what to answere, but so simply and so sottishly, as euerie child may espie the follie of their doctrine. If any papist can truly and without blushing say the contrarie, let the same be notified by his answere, to these my briefe demands. 1. First, I demaund how they excuse the people that adore with diuine worship, the thing eleuated ouer the priests head at Masse, from idolatrie, from heresie, from false beleefe. For if either the Priest want intention to consecrate (which often chanceth by reason of wādring imaginations) or of purpose meaneth not to consecrate, or of negligence omitteth any worde of consecration, then by popish religion the thing adored, is but pure bread, & so the adorers therof become idolaters, worshipping a peece of bread for the euerliuing God. If the people either refuse to adore, or doubt if they may adore, they are deemed heretiques *ipso facto* for their paines, because as the Popes dusholy canons tel vs, he that but doubteth of Romish

Cap. dubium de hæret. Nauarr. cap. 11. parag. 18. Bartholom. fumus de hæres. parag. 17

miſh definitions, concerning faith and manners, is an heretike.

2 Secondly, I demaund what it is that the prieſt receiueth & deliuereth to the communicants, when he hauing 40. breads before him, ſupoſeth them to be but 38. or 39. and ſo intendeth to conſecrate no more? for beyond the prieſts intention, conſecration cannot extend, as all wiſe Papiſts grant, neither is his intention more limitted to one bread then to another, & therfore can no more conſecrate one bred thē another.

3 Thirdly, I demaunde which part of the hoſt as they terme it, is the popiſh made God, when the ſacrificer intendeth indefinitelie to conſecrate the one halfe of the ſaide hoſt, and howe there in adoring they can auoide Idolatrie.

4 Fourthly, I demaund how many Gods, or how many times God is made in one and the ſame hoſte, in and at that Maſſe, when all the newly made prieſts do conſecrate, in their Romiſh Church Latheran? for they are all appointed to conſecrate, they doe all pronounce the words, they are all bounden to haue intention, & yet when the principall author, to wit, the Biſhop, is at the laſt ſillable, ſome of the reſt be in the middeſt, ſome in the beginning, ſome in one place, ſome in another, neuer a one jumping with other in that inſtant, in which they ſhould their bread-god make: for of this matter are three ſolemn diſſonant opinions, amongſt the great Romiſh Rabbins. Pope Innocentius holdeth, that all doe conſecrate: Durandus auoucheth that that Prieſt onely conſecrateth, which with greateſt ſpeed commeth to the end: but Cardinall Caietan hath another conſideration. *Ioſephus Angles, in 4. ſ. q. 7. de Euchariſt. 8. diffic.*

5 Fifthly, I demaund concerning their words of conſecration, what is in the prieſts hand whē he hath vtred al the words ſaue one? if they anſwere the body of Chriſt, then doth it followe, that the principall word of their conſecration is needleſſe, that their words of conſecration be vncertain, and that their conſecratorie words ſo called, be not cauſatiue of their falſely ſuppoſed effect: if they ſay it is pure bread, or bread in ſubſtance but altred in quality, then doth it followe neceſſarily, that the conſecration conſiſteth of the laſt word only, and that all the reſt are meer extrincicall to their imagind tranſubſtantiatiō: if they ſay it is neither Chriſts body, nor bread, but an vnknown ſubſtance, or as they term it ſomtime, *individuum vagum*. we may truly tell thē, that their certenty of their idolatrous ſacrament, is as vncertē as the wether cock. Sixtly, I demand of them how Chriſts naturall body being large, is contained in a round cake being litle, ſince Chriſts body is a true organical body, which hath diuers parts euery one diſtant from another:

Aquinas p.3. q.76.art.4. they say that Christes bodie is there without dimensions, their owne angelicall, and famous Doctor Aquinas is against them: if they say, that though it cānot be so by natural power, yet can god miraculusly bring so much to passe: to that I answere, that so to say canot serue their turn, for by the confession of all learned men, yea, euen of al popish schoolmen and Doctors, there be many things which God cannot doe, or rather many things which can no way be done: for example, God cannot sin, God cannot make time past not to be past, God cannot make that a blinde man remaining blinde, do not want his sight, though he cau giue sight to the blind: God cannot make that a dead man remaining dead, haue life, though he can restore life to the dead: in fine, god can doe nothing that implieth contradiction: and yet doeth not this want of doing, argue impotencie in God, who is omnipotent, but defect in the thing that should be done. Now so it is, that this imagined being of Christes bodie in a little round cake implyeth in it selfe contradiction, & consequently, cannot possibly be done. For example, no power can bring to passe, that a bodie being sixe cubits long, and two cubits broad, remaining still so long and broad, shall be contained in another body, being only three cubits long, and one cubite broad: & the reason hereof is, because so to containe, and be contained, implieth contradiction. And this is the case nowe put, of Christs bodie in the round popish cake. Let al the papists in England or elswhere solue this reason, and I wil be their bondman. And if they cannot solu it, (which indeed is impossible to be don) then must they perforce cōfesse which they would not, that their doctrine is ridiculous, imposible, and execrable.

Seuenthly, I demaund how they can defend Christes bodie from being broken and deuided, when they breake and deuide their round cakes, since by their doctrine Chrrstes bodie is really contained in the same?

Eightly, I demaund how they can distinguish deuision of the bread, from consecration of the same, or how they can deny it to be of equal force with consecration thereof? for by consecration of one breade, Christes bodie is but in one place: but by deuision of one breade, his body is locally in many places at once.

Here endeth the first Booke.

THE

THE SECOND BOOKE, WHEREIN are confuted the principall grounds of all Romish Religion.

CAP. 1.

Of the principall groundes of all Romish faith and Religion.

TWo thinges there be which mightilie keepe all Papists in a certaine externall vniformitie of Religion: as all, whosoeuer deeplie ponder the same, must perforce acknowledge with me. The one is the seuere punishment aed sharpe tortures, executed vppon all persons whatsoeuer without exception; of what degree, state, or condition soeuer, that doe but once whisper against the least iote of Popish religion: for better successe and more free passage of the said romish religion, the laicall people are prohibited by Popish canon law, vnder paine of excommunication, not to reason at all in matters of Faith; and the learned not to examine or discusse, how farre the popes power doth extend; whatsoeuer or howsoeuer, hee appoint them to beleeue: which their owne popishe Fryer *Franciscus à Victoria* did not dissemble, when out of their owne canon lawe, hee vttered these expresse wordes. *Non spectat ad subditos determinare aut examinare, quid possit Papa, aut quid non possit,, & quomodo teneantur parere vel non, quia sacrilegium est disputare de potentia Principis, & præcipue Papa.*

Cap. quicunq; de hæret. lib. 6

Victor. relect. 4. de potest papæ, & concilij proposit. 16.

It belongeth not to Popish vassals, to determine or examine what the Pope may do, or what he may not doe. For his law hath made it sacriledge, to dispute of the Popes power: yea, this their irreligious manner of proceeding is executed in such strict sort, as neither any of the laytie nor of the Clergie, can vnder paine of Popish excommunication, reade either the Old or New Testament, translated into the vulgar tongue, or any other booke of cotrouersie, or Diuinity, set forth by any not professed vassall vnto the pope, vnlesse such person or persons be especially licensed from the Pope thereunto. All which is confirmed by daily practise of the Romishe churche: insomuch, as if any vtter any one word, that may anye way sounde or bee racked to the dislike of Popish doctrine, that man shall by and by bee cast into their disholy inquisition, and shortly after be burnt with fire & faggot, vnlesse he both sweat and subscribe to euery article, of their erroneous Romish religion. And further, vnlesse hee also protest by oath, to disclose whomsoeuer he knoweth then, or shall know afterwarde,

Pius 4. in bulla synod Trident.

ward, to hold any opinion against the said Romish Religion. Naye, thogh a man be neuer so soûd a Papist, yet if he be but found in company with his deare friend, who in affection is opposite to the romish religion, that self-sound Papist shal be put in the inquisition, and ther abide with hard vsage, vntill he pay the last farthing. This to be so, M. Massey of Audford in Cheshire must witnes with me, who is this day in Chester gaole for his wilfull seditious behauiour: for he (though at that time fled into Italy for popish zeale,) was yet thrust into the romish inquisition with yong maister Dutton now his son in law: where how long they remained, what was their intertainment, to what they did sweare, and so forth, before they were dismissed, *ætatem habent*, let them answere for themselues, they are yet liuing: it is needles for me to tell their tale. One Aldcorne likewise a cittizen of Yorke, was cast into the said Romish disholy inquisition, vpon a very light or rather no suspicion, and there vsed very hardly a long time, though he were indeed a papist, and had no language saue onely his vulgar English tong. This man is yet liuing in Yorke, let him say if it be not as I do write.

I my selfe was a mean for his dispatch, and so am not ignorant of his case. A thing more strange then the rest: If one passe by an image or their house of inquisition (which they term the holy house) & do not reuerence thereunto, it is inough to cast that man into the said disholy prison. Which kind of sharp correction, if it were vpon just causes executed within her Maiesties Dominions, shortly fewe or no disloyall subiects, would be found in England. Neither is this my bare opinion, but the constant resolution of that most graue, wise, learned, and holy father S. Augustin, who though sometime he had bene of the contrary opinion, was neuertheless taught by long experience to acknowledge it: these are his expresse words.

Aug. epist. 48. ad Vincent. Tom. 2.

Donatistæ nimium inquieti sunt; quos per ordinatas à Deo potestates cohiberi atq; corrigi mihi non videtur inutile: nam de multorum iam correctione gaudemus, qui tàm veraciter vnitatem Catholicam tenent, atque defendunt, & à pristino errore se liberatos esse lætantur, vt eos cum magna gratulatione mirentur. qui tamen nescio qua vi consuetudinis nullo modo maturi in melius cogitarent, nisi hoc terrore perculsi. & paulo post: nam mea primitus sententia erit, neminem ad vnitatem christianam esse cogendum, verbo esse agendũ, disputatione pugnandum, ratione vincendum, ne fictos catholicos haberemus, quos apertos hæreticos noueramus. Sed hæc opinio mea nõ contradicentium verbis, sed demonstrantium superabatur exemplis. nam primò mihi opponebatur ciuitas

nitas mea, quæ cum tota esset in parte Donati, ad vnitatem catholicam timore legum imperialium conversa est.

The Donatists are to vnquiet, and therefore I thinke it conuenient that they be restrained and corrected by powers ordeined of God, for we alreadie haue ioy of many, by reason of their correction, who keep and defend catholike vnitie so sincerely, and so reioyse, that they are deliuered from their old errour, as we with great congratulation doe admire them; who for all that I know not by what force of custome, would neuer once thinke of reforming themselues, but only through this feare and terror. My former opinion was, that none should bee constrained to christian vnitie, that we should striue with the worde, contend with disputation, and ouercom with reason: least we shuld haue them counterfait catholikes, whom we had knowne to be open hereticks. But this my opinion was ouer-ruled not with words of contradiction, but with examples of demonstration. For first of all, mine owne citty was obiected vnto me, which standing wholy vppon Donatists, was for all that brought to catholicke vnity, by sharpe imperiall lawes. Thus farre S. Augustine.

A point worthy to be wel considred, as which greatly respecteth our case in England.

The other thing is a point of so great importance, as none can be more: for if it were true, as the Papists with tooth and naile auouch it to be, then were all other religions false, and theirs onely true: for there is but one God, one faith, one baptisme, one Religion; yet if it be false, as false it is indeed, (which by the power of God I shal proue by euident demonstration, and that euen by the testimonies of the best learned popish doctors:) then must their religion of necessitie be naught, howsoeuer others be. This great and weighty point is, that the Pope cannot erre in his definitiue sentence, whether hee define concerning faith or manners. For (say they) Christ committed his church to saint Peter, praying that his faith should neuer faile: and consequently, he prayed that the Pope as Pope should neuer erre, bicause the Pope is saint Peters successour, and Christs vicar generall on earth. I saie, the Pope as Pope with reduplication in waie of my sincere dealing with the Papists, becausse by the vniforme consent of all learned Papists *Albertus Pighius* only excepted: the pope in his own priuate person may be a Iudas, a Fornicator, a simonist, an homicide, an Vsurer, an Atheist, an Hereticke: and for his manifold iniquities be damned into hell. That this is the doctrine of all Papistes, aswel concerning the popes priuate person, as touching his iudiciall definitiõs,

is confeſſed by *Robertus Bellarminus*, *Bartholomeus Carranza*, *Melchior Canus*, *Dominicus Soto*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Antoninus*, *Caietanus*, *Cauarruuius*, and others: but that the Pope as Pope and publicke perſon can erre, that all the ſaide Papiſts with their complices conſtantly denie: as which one only point once confeſſed, would vtterly confound them, and make fruſtrate their whole Religion. For in all difficulties, doubts, and diſtreſſes, the Papiſts haue euer recourſe vnto this point, as vnto the diuine Oracle of great god *Apollo*: that is to ſaye, the church of Rome teacheth ſo: ergo we muſt beleeue ſo. This point, as it maketh many others to be Papiſts, ſo made it my ſelfe one, and kept me one, vntill by Gods holy inſpiration, I perceiued the abſurditie thereof. This point therefore ſhall by Gods helpe, be ſo effectuallie proued throughout the chapters following: as if any Papiſte in England, or elſe-where in Europe, (I ſpeake a bigge worde for the confidence I haue in the iuſtice and verity of the cauſe,) can truly and ſubſtantially confute the ſame: I will once againe embrace his religion, which notwithſtanding, I abhorre and deteſt as the poiſon of my ſoule. And my proceedings throughout this whole treatiſe ſhall bee ſuch, and ſo ſincere: as if I can be conuinced by the aduerſary, eyther to alledge any writer corruptlie, or to quote anie place guilefully, or to charge any author falſly, I will neuer require credite at the readers hand, neither in this worke nor in any other, that I ſhall publiſhe at anie time hereafter: requeſting the aduerſarie that ſhall perhapps replie vpon me (which is but reaſon:) to vſe like ſinceritie, and to couenant in like manner with me. Which, if he refuſe to grant and obſerue, he ſhall condemne himſelfe in euerie wiſe mannes iudgement before he begin.

God grant that others may perceiue it, as I haue done.

The ſecond Chapter, of the Popes Pardons, *with the quantity, quality, and* originall thereof.

VVOnderfully haue the Popes or Biſhops of Rome ſeduced gods people, manie and ſundrie waies: but neuer more groſſlie infatuated or bewitched them, then by their ridiculous, monſtrous, and execrable pardons: as which are foolish, vncertaine, abſurd, new, and the deadlie wounds of all Popiſh doctrine. For plaine and euident demonſtration of this aſſertion, I put downe theſe concluſions following.

Two

The first Conclusion.

THe Popes Pardons are too too fooliſh, as which are repugnant to common ſence and reaſon. My profe ſtandeth thus: all relaxations being larger then anie man liuing or dead doth or can need, are too too fooliſh, but the Popes pardons are ſuch: Ergo, the Popes Pardons are to to fooliſh. The conſequence is good, and the conſequent directlie and truelie inferred vppon the premiſſes, as which is *In prima figura*, and *Modo darii*, as the Logicians tearme it: the propoſition is ſo euident, as none can or will deny the ſame; ſo the difficultie reſteth onlie in the aſſumption which I proue 3. ſeuerall waies.

Firſt, by the huge and infinite numbers of Pardons, hanged vp in pardoning tables at the pillers of euerie church for the moſt parte in Rome; which not onlie my ſelfe haue ſeene and read, but many thouſands beſides.

Secondlie, by pardons conteining manie thouſand yeares, expreſſlie ſet downe in old Engliſh Primers: whereof the Papiſts ſeem now at length ſo aſhamed, that the like is not to be found in the new Tridentine Primers.

Thirdly, by a little Pamphlet of the maruellous things of Rome, which is commonlie to be ſold euerie where, one of which I brought from thence my ſelfe and haue at this houre. For in all theſe 3. pardons are granted prodigally, (I wold ſaie charitablie,) for many thouſand yeares: yea in the little Romiſh Pamphlet to omit other Churches, are granted euerie day to S. Iohn Euangeliſts church, 6048. years of Pardon. Now, leaſt any be ſo ſottiſh as to imagine, that a man can need ſo many years of Pardon, that I will diſproue ſundrie waies.

Firſt, becauſe it is againſt the holy ſcripture, that any man ſhoulde liue ſo long.

ימי שנותינו בהם שבעים שנה ואם בגבורות שמונים שנה׃

The daies of our yeares is then 70. and if they be of ſtrength 80. years. Which words S. *Hierome* gloſſeth in this manner:

Vbi ſunt mille anni? in ſeptuaginta annis, contracti ſumus, ſi autem multũ, octoginta. Si autem plus vixerimus, iam non eſt vita ſed mors. Hier. in pſ. 98

Where are the thouſand yeares (that they liued of old?) we are now brought to ſcuentie yeares, and if we endure long, to eightye. But if we liue longer, then is it not life but death.

Secondlie, becauſe no man can abide ſo long in Purgatorie. And leaſt ſome papiſt replie, and ſay, that one may be ſo long in purgato-

Bellar. lib. 3. de Rom. pont. c. 3.

rie, I will proue my aſſertion by the beſt popiſh doctors. Bellarminus in his defence of the pope thinketh that opinion very probable, which holdeth, that the world ſhall not henceforth endure aboue 400. years at the moſt. And of his opinion are great learned men, Irenæus, Iuſtinus, Lactantius, and others: yea ſaint Auguſtine and S. Hierom, are not diſſonant from that ſuppoſition. The Thalmudiſts likewiſe had a propheſie of Elyas, as they ſay: that the world ſhould continue ſixe thouſand yeares, to wit: 2000. before the Law, 2000. in the law, and 2000. after the law: that is from Chriſts incarnation vntill the ſecond aduent, or Doomeſ-day. Dominicus Soto commenting vpon the maiſter of Sentences, holdeth as a ſtable and conſtant ground, that no ſoul in Purgatorie abideth the paines therof aboue ten yeares. And doubtleſſe if the Popes pardons κατ' ἀξίαν were of force, *Soto* his opinion could not be falſe: the reaſon thereof is euident, becauſe all that will may vpon ſmall ſute (if not without ſute) haue not onely for themſelues but for their friends alſo, ſo many thouſands of pardons as they ſhall deſire: which liberalitie in pardoning, Pope Gregorie beſtowed on our diſloyall captaine Stukeley, when he employed him to inuade his naturall countrey England. But as the pardons were counterfaite, and Stukleys hart diſloyall, ſo was the Popes intention fruſtrate, and Stukeley rewarded accordinglie: that is, iuſtlie ſlain for his proud attempt, whileſt my ſelfe was at Rome.

Soto in 4. lib. Petri Lomba. diſt. 19. q. 3. arg. 2.

The 2. Concluſion.

THe vertue and efficacie of Popes pardons is ſo vncertain & doubtfull, and that euen amongſt the greateſt Popiſh doctors, as themſelues cannot tell what in the world to ſaie or thinke therof. This concluſion I proue thus: *Angelus de Clauaſio*, a famous Canoniſt and religious Fryer, reciteth ſixe ſeuerall and diſſonant opinions concerning the vertue of pardons, and after he hath confuted them all, he ſetteth downe the ſeuenth for his owne, and the beſt, which as hee ſaieth is true. It is therefore noe doubt ſubſtantiall, as ſhortly ſhall be ſeene: The firſt opinion (ſaith our holy Frier) holdeth, that the Popes pardons onely remit that puniſhment which God appointeth to be impoſed in another world, for a ſupplie vnto thoſe, who haue don pennance onely according to the Canons, but doth in no caſe remit that penance which is impoſed and taxed by the Canons. The ſecond opinion holdeth, that the pardons onely forgiue that pennance, which is taxed by the lawe and penitentiall Canons; but not that paine which

Angelus de indulgentia.

God's

Gods Iuſtice appointeth to be impoſed. The third opinion holdeth, that Pardons forgiue paine due for ſinne, aſwell before God as before his Church: but this opinion addeth a clauſe ſo ſharp, as our holie father doeth not brooke it: to wit, that the Pope is bound to doe pennance for that perſon whom he pardoneth. The fourth opinion holdeth, that the paine of hell is partly remitted by the Popes pardons, as which becommeth thereby more tollerable. The fift opinion holdeth, that that pennance onely is pardoned, which the party omitted of negligence, not of purpoſe or contempt. The ſixt opinion holdeth, that the Popes pardons remit not onely pennance impoſed by the prieſt, but that alſo which is taxed of God: marry this oppinion hath one limitation, which forſooth is this: that the Prieſt muſt bee content therewith, or elſe the Pope cannot worke his will. The ſeauenth opinion holdeth, that Popiſh Pardons forgiue, and are worth ſo much as the wordes of the Pardons do ſound: that is to ſay, if the Pardons containe an hundred thouſand yeares, then the partye obtaining ſuch Pardons at the Popes handes, muſt haue remiſſion of ſo many yeares. Thus Gentle Reader ſtandeth the doctrine of popiſh pardons, amongſt the greateſt Doctors of that faction. He that lyſteth to peruſe the place quoted by me out of Angelus, ſhall finde euerye thing as I haue ſet it downe. The rehearſall of the varietie and vncertaintie of theſe opinions, is a moſt ſufficient confutation of the ſame. *Sylueſter Prieras* a great Thomiſt, and ſometime Maiſter of the ſacred Pallace, reciteth three ſeuerall opinions, and diſliking them al, ſetteth downe the fourth for the truth. *Antoninus* ſometime the Archbiſhop of Florence, alledgeth three opinions, and ſcarce knoweth which of them he ſhould preferre. *Bellarminus* in his written diſputations abridged by *Robert Parſons* his brother Ieſuite, defendeth and approoueth another opinion plaine oppoſite to all yet rehearſed, and maketh indeed the Pope Pardons not worth a button: which is the cauſe (as I probably coniecture) that the third and laſt part of his diſputations is not permitted as yet to come abroade: and either will neuer bee publiſhed, or wholy omitted, or at leaſt chaunged before it come abroad. The Councell of Trent ſpeaketh verie ſlenderly and coldlye, of the Popes Pardons.

The Popes religion is meere opinatiue.

Sylueſter de indulgent.

The third Concluſion.

TO giue Pardons as the Pope doeth, is a ſtrange and new doctrine of a moſt damnable Religion, which neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles

ſtles euer taught or practiſed. This I will proue, as I do other things, by the expreſſe teſtimonies of the Popes owne renowned Doctors: that ſo all the world may perceiue and behold Papiſtrie conſtured and confounded, by Papiſtrie it ſelfe. *Sylueſter* reputed, and as it were ſurnamed *Abſolutus Theologus*, hath theſe very wordes:

Sylueſter de indulg.

Indulgentia nobis per Scripturam minimè innotuit, licet inducatur illud Apoſtoli, (ſi quid donaui vobis,) ſed nec per dicta antiquorum Doctorum, ſed modernorum.

The Popes pardons (ſayth the Popes owne deare Doctour) were neuer knowne to vs by the ſcriptures, although ſome alleadge Sainte Paule for that purpoſe: neither were they knowne by the ancient Fathers, but onelie by late writers. *Antoninus* in his firſt part hath the verie wordes already cited, and holdeth the ſelfe-ſame opinion with Fryer *Sylueſter*. *Petrus Lombardus*, who with great dilligence collected into one volume, all worthie ſentences of the auncient Fathers: and therefore was ſurnamed the Maiſter of Sentences, maketh no mention of the Popes pardons at all; as which he could not find, notwithſtanding his painefull induſtry imployed in that kind of exerciſe. For as *Sylueſter* trulie writeth, the olde Writers were not acquainted with any ſuch thing. The like may be ſaide of ſaint *Cyprian*, S: *Auguſtine*, Saint *Hierome*, *Nazianzene*, and others of antiquitie: for which cauſe *Durand*, *Caietain*, and ſundrie other Schoole-men, affirme the Popes manner of pardoning, to be a new thing in the church of god. Neither can *Dominicus Soto* deny the ſame indeed, albeit hee buſieth himſelfe more then a little, in the Popes defence if it would be. Yea, the Originall of the Popiſh pardoning is ſo verie young, as their famous martyr and Biſhop M. Fisher in his anſwere to M. Luthers articles, was enforced to admit the newneſſe and young age of the ſame, and to yeild this reaſon in defence thereof: to wit, that Purgatory was not ſo well knowne at that time to the Church, as nowe it is. Which ſaying I weene is true indeed, becauſe Purgatorie and Pardons were not heard of in olde time; and now onely knowne by vaine, groſſe, and ſenſuall imaginations. O Worthy Pardons? O braue Purgatory? O holy Pope of Rome? What ſtrong reaſons, what forceable arguments, what graue authorities are alleadged in your behalfe? Lette vs heare with attention the finall reſolution hereof, ſet downe by *Sylueſter* and *Antoninus* for their holy father the Pope.

Antoninus part. 1. tit. 10. cap. 3.

Lombardus coulde not find the pops pardons in the holy Fathers.

Soto in 4. ſent. diſt. 21. q. 1. art. 3.

Roffenſis cont. art. Luther.

Sylueſter & Antoninus vbi ſupra.

Quia inquiunt, Eccleſia hoc facit & ſervat, credendum eſt ita eſſe.

Becauſe

Becauſe the Church this doeth, and thus obſerueth, we muſt beleeue that it is ſo. Loe, a ſhort and ſweet concluſion: as if they ſhuld ſaie, though we can proue the Popes pardons, neither by Scriptures, nor by fathers, nor by reaſons, yet muſt we beleeue them, becauſe the Church, that is, the Pope ſaith ſo, whoe cannot erre: which ſaying, (gentle Reader) both hath beene, and is, the ſole and only foundation of all notorious Papiſtry. The foundation of all Poperie.

The 4. Concluſion.

THe Popes manner of pardoning, argueth aſwell inordinate affection of filthie lucre, as alſo want of charity. His want of charitie is proued, and conuinced, in that he can deliuer (as his Religion teacheth) all ſoules out of Purgatorie with his word: and neuertheleſſe ſuffreth them to abide moſt bitter torments, ſo many yeares in that affliction. For the Papiſtes holde, that the paines of Purgatorie are as great and painefull, as be the torments of hell: and that they differ accidentallie in this onely, becauſe the paines of purgatorie ſhall once haue an end, but the paines of hell neuer. Thus writeth *Sylueſter Prieras.*

Sylueſter vbi ſup. Par. 7.

Sicut poteſt (Papa) liberare à pœna peccatorum debita in hoc mundo omnes qui ſunt in mundo, ſi faciant quod mandat, etiamſi eſſent millies plures quàm ſunt: ita liberare poteſt omnes qui ſunt in Purgatorio, ſiquis pro eis faciat quod iubet.

As the Pope can deliuer all in this world, from paine due for ſinne in this world, if they do that which he appointeth, though they were thouſands more then they be: euen ſo can he deliuer all that are in Purgatorie, if any do that for them which he commandeth: and leaſt anie man ſhould thinke that impoſſible, or a very difficult matter, that the Pope requireth to be done: *Sylueſter* in another place telleth vs, that it is a thing moſt eaſie. Theſe be his words:

Sylueſter vbi ſup. Par. 7.

Indulgentiæ ſimpliciter tantum valent, quantum prædicantur, modò ex parte dantis ſit authoritas, ex parte recipientis charitas, & ex parte cauſæ pietas.

Pardons are ſimply worth ſo much as they are preached, ſo there be autoritie in the giuer, charity in the receiuer, & pietie in the cauſe or motive. But ſo it is, that the ſoules in Purgatorie be in charity by popiſh confeſſion, for elſe they could not be out of hell: & that the pope hath authoritie, as alſo that he granteth his Pardons for good and godlie cauſes, I ſuppoſe no Papiſt will denie: if they do, my argument is the ſtronger, and my ſelfe ſhall eaſilie agree thereto. *Bartholomæus Fumus* confirmeth this point, when he thus writeth.

Bartholomæus Fumus de Papa Par. 11.

Papa

Papa posset liberare omnes animas Purgatorij, etiam si plures essent, si quis pro eis faceret quod iuberet, peccaret tamen indiscretè eos cedendo.

The Pope could set at liberty all the soules of Purgatorie though neuer so manie, if any would do that for them, which hee appointed: marrie he should sinne by his undiscreet pardoning. And the popish schoole-doctor *Viguerius* proceedeth further, and auoucheth it to bee neither inconuenient, nor against the Iustice of God: these are his expresse words.

Viguerius de sacrament. ordinis in fine.

Nec est inconveniens quòd Papa purgatorium posset evacuare, non enim per hoc aliquid detraheretur Divinæ iustitiæ.

Neither is it inconvenient that the Pope can harrow hell, for that doth nothing derogate from the ivstice of God. Now to say that he can this doe, but yet doth it not, to keepe himselfe from sinne, is altogither vaine and friuolous. For first, he should no more sinne in deliuering all, then he doth in setting one onely at libertie, as is alreadie proued by *Sylvester* and *Viguerius*. Againe, plenarie pardons are so cõmon at the houre of death, as none that eyther haue friends or mony are or can be destitute thereof: which yet is a point more indiscreete then the other, by their owne doctrine. Thirdly, the three conditions required for the legitimation of Popish pardoning, concurre as sweetly in deliuering all togither ioyntlie, as in deliuering one by one seuerally. His inordinate affection of lucre is conuinced in this, that albeit he can with one onely pardon set open the gates of Purgatory, and so set all the prisoners at libertie; yet wil he not extend that compassion to them, but taketh this course with them, that they shall appoint *Pia-Legata* by their last Willes and testaments, for Masses, Diriges, and trentals, to be saide yearely, or rather perpetuallie, (if their abilitie will extend so farre:) with which Masses, Diriges, and trentals his pardons shall concurre, and so deliuer them by discretion. By reason of which vngodly pollicie, we may this day behold with our eyes, so many altars erected, so many Churches sumptuously decked, so many Priests richly maintained, especially in saint Gregories church at Rome. For which Masses, Diriges, and Trentals, huge summes of money are giuen daily, yearely, perpetuallie, not for the Masses formallie *concedo*, but yet formally for the Priests paines, and materiallie for the Masses, *constanter assero*.

The fift Conclusion.

The

THe foundation of the Popes pardons is wicked, blasphemous, and derogatorie to the most precious blood of Christ, shed for mans redemption. This is the proofe of this conclusion: the Pope and many of his Popish Doctors tell vs, that the foundation of their Popishe pardons is this, *Thesaurus meritorum Christi, & Sanctorum eius*: the treasure of the merits of Christ, and of his Saints. For saye they, not onely Christ, but many of his Saints also, suffered much more then was due for their owne sinnes: which workes of supererogation or satisfactions, they call the treasure of the Church: and because (say they) Gods Saintes did not apply those their superaboundante passions to this or that person, the Pope therefore must make application thereof at his pleasure, as one that hath Christes full authoritie, or *plenitudinem potestatis*, being his Vicar general vpon earth. And here note by the way (gentle Reader,) that for the execution of this Vicars office, there be euer in Rome two Vicars generall, and one substitute Vicar, whereof two neither preach, teach, or execute any priestly function vsuallie: but the poore substitute, muste doe all that is done. So in my time, *Gregorie* the fourteenth was Vicar generall to Christ, *si dijs placet*, Cardinal *Sabello* Vicar-general to *Gregorie*, and our Godwell Bishop of Saint *Assaph*, substitute to *Sabello*: which poore Bishop tooke all the paine, and had the least gaine. For it is not the vsuall manner of Popes and Cardinals in these latter dayes, to say Masse, to preach, to teach, and so foorth, (I speake of Cardinals resiant at Rome,) but to joyne liuing to liuing, benefice to benefice, promotion to promotion, and which is more absurd in their owne religion, to be lordly Abbots, or rather so idle Lubbards, that they will take and snatch all the commodities of the whole Abbeyes vnto themselues, and neither graunte sufficiente foode and rayment for the Monkes nor competent allowance for the necessarie maintenance of the house it selfe, for their Masses, Mattins, and seruice: Such is the charitie to their neighbors, zeal to their office and reuerence to their own religion. This is also true, as if any Papist wil deny the same, his owne breath will witnesse against him. For to omit others, S. *Laurence* and S. *Pancratius* their Abbeyes and Churches are so poore and beggerly (through the pilling and polling of Cardynals their Abbots,) that when priestes come thither to say Masse, (as the vsuall manner there is,) they can neither finde wine nor candles without money: which default when any one obiecteth as a disgrace to their profession and Religion, the poore Monkes aunswere in this

Sylueſt. de indulg. Pat. 4 Soto in 4 sent. dist. & art 2.

Here would I learne, why the K. Maiest may not imploy abbeyes to the maintenance of the whole Realm, with suppresion of abuses: as well as the Pope may bestow the same vpon irreligious and ydle Cardinals.

manner; Alas, we can not doe with all, my L. Cardinall hath all the liuing, and alloweth vs a ſmall portion, not able to fill our bellies. But to leaue this digreſsion, and to return to the ſcope and matter in hand: this foundation of pardons to be the ſuperaboundant merits and ſatiſfactions, not onely of Chriſt, but of his Saints alſo, holdeth Thomas Aquinas, Dominicus Soto, Sylueſter Pryeras, Antoninus, and others. Sylueſter hath theſe wordes:

Sylueſt. de indulg. Par. 4

Ratio quare valere poſſunt indulgentiæ, eſt vnitas corporis myſtici, in qua multi ſupererogauerunt ad menſuram debitorum ſuorum, & multas tribulationes iniuſtè ſuſtinuerunt patienter, per quas multitudo pœnarum poterat expiari, ſi eis deberetur: quorum meritorum tanta eſt copia, quòd omnem pœnam debitam nunc viuentibus excedunt, & præcipuè propter meritum Chriſti.

Ioſ. Ang. in 4. ſent. queſt. de indulg. holds the ſelfeſame opinion.

The cauſe that pardons are of force, is the vnity of the myſtical bodie, in which many haue ſupererogated in the woorkes of penance, to the meaſure of their owne demerites, and haue ſuſtained patiently many vniuſt tribulations, through which the multitude of paines might be purged, if it were due vnto them: of whoſe merits there is ſuch plenty, that they exceede all paine due for thoſe that nowe be liuing, and eſpecially for the merite of Chriſt. This is the teſtimonie of Sylueſter, and Aquinas their angelical Doctor proceedeth further, and ſayth thus:

Tho. Aquin. in ſupplem. q. 25. art. primo.

Chriſtus poterat relaxare, ergo & Paulus potuit, ergo & Papa poteſt, qui non eſt minoris poteſtatis in Eccleſia quam Paulus fuit.

Chriſt could pardon, therefore Paul could pardon, therefore the Pope alſo can pardō: as who is of no meaner authority in the church, then Paul himſelf was. So then *à primo ad vltimum* by Aquinas his doctrine, the Pope can doe as much as Chriſt. He can make the deafe to heare, the dumbe to ſpeake, the lame to walke, the blinde to ſee, and the dead to ariſe to life: which I muſt firſt ſee before I beleeue it, how ſoeuer their holy Aquinas write: and yet ſhould this follow neceſſarily, if Aquinas his reaſon weere good. And doubtleſſe, this which Aquinas here attributeth to the Pope, is not far from the peculiar mark of Antichriſt, but I will not now ſtand vpon that point. Wee ſee euidently the foundation of popiſh pardons confeſſed by the beſt learned Romiſh Doctours; which manner of eſtabliſhing popiſh pardons, to be blaſphemous and derogatorie to the bloud of Chriſt. I proue many and ſundry waies. Firſt, by the teſtimony of holy writ.

The Popes power as great as Chriſts.

Ad

Aduocatum habemus apud Patrem Iesum Christum iustum, & ipse est propitiatio pro peccatis nostris. 1 Ioha 1,1

We haue an *Aduocate* with the Father Iesus Christ the iust, and he is the propitiation for our sinnes. *And* as it is said more significantly in the Greeke, Αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστι. He is the atonement and reconciliation for our sinnes: it is he, through whome we are accepted of God. Of him only said the voice from heauen, this is my beloued Son, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, in whome I am well pleased. Matth. 3.17 *Againe,* 1 Ioh. 1,7,8

Si autem in luce ambulemus, sicut ipse est in luce, societatem habemus ad inuicem, & sanguis Iesu Christi Filij eius emundat nos ab omni peccato

If we walke in the light, as he is in the light, we haue fellowshippe one with another, and the bloud of Iesus Christ doeth clense vs from all sinne. *Againe,* Heb 10,14

Una oblatione consummauit in sempiternum sanctificatos.

With one onely oblation hath hee consummate for euer, those that are sanctified. *Againe,*

Ego Dominus Deus tuus ex terra Aegypti, & Deum absq; me nescies, & saluator non est praeter me. Osee. 13,4

I am the Lord thy God, which broght thee out of the land of Egipt, and thou shalt know no God without me, and there is no Sauiour but my selfe. *againe,* Esay. 43,25

Ego sum, Ego sum ipse, qui deleo iniquitates tuas propter me.

I, euen I am he, that blotte out thine iniquities for mine owne sake. Which is most significantly vttered in the Hebrew phrase.

אנכי אנכי הוא מחה פשעיך למעני.

I, euen I mine owne selfe wipe away, and vtterly destroy thy rebellious transgressions, for none other cause but for mine own sake. *Againe.* Esay 53,5

Ipse vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras, attritus est propter scelera nostra

He was wounded for our iniquities, he was torne for our offences. By which manifold places of holy Scripture it is euident, that Christ did both merite eternall glory for vs, and also did offer to his Father eternall satisfaction for our sinnes. Which S. Augustine declareth finely, in briefe and pithie words:

Dominicus noster Iesus Christus mori venit, peccare non venit, communicando, nobiscum sine culpa poenam, & culpam soluit & poenam. Aug. ser. 141. de tempor. to. x

Our Lorde Iesus came to die, he came not to sin, communicating

paine with vs without sinne, he clensed both the sin, and the paine of the sin. I proue the same secondly by the euident testimonies of the Popes owne Doctors, because no better arguments can possibly be alledged against them, then such as themselues haue made and approoued. Angelus writeth thus:

Ang. de indul. Par 9. *Communis opinio tam Theologorum, quàm Canonistarum tenet, quòd indulgentia sunt ex abundantia meritorum, quæ vltra mensuram demeritorum suorũ sancti sustinuerunt, & Christus: sed ego teneo cùm Francisco de Mayrone, quòd cùm merita sanctorum sint vltra condignum remunerata à Deo, & sic exhausta. quòd solum dantur ex merito Christi, & passionis eius.*

Mayre in 4. sent. dist. 19 The common opinion aswell of Deuines as of Canonistes, holdeth that pardons be granted of the abundant merits, which Christ and his Saints here suffered, farre aboue the measure of their demerits: but I, (saith Angelus) hold with Frauncis Mayro, that since God hath remunerated the merits of his Saintes aboue their condigne deserts, and so they are exhaust, nothing remaining vnrewarded, that pardons only are giuen of the merit of Christ, & of his passion. Durandus also a famous popish Doctor, holdeth the selfe same opinion with Angelus: for albeit he admitteth the treasure of Christ, yet doth he deny the treasure & supererogations of Saintes: and that, because as Angelus and Mayro teach, Saints haue receiued remuneration far abou their deserts: which opinion of Durandus, Angelus, and Mayro, S. Paul confirmeth in his Epistle to the Romanes, in these words:

Durand in 4. sent. dist. 20.

Rom. 18, 8. Λογίζομαι γὰρ, ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. For I count, that the afflictions of this present time are not woorthy of the future glory, which shall be reuealed towards vs: in which words, the Apostle confuteth manifestly that fooliſh distinction of the Papists, vnto which they flee as to an holy sanctuarie, so often as they feele themselues galled in defence of the Popes pardons. They say forsooth, that Saints haue receiued full remuneration as their woorks be meritorious, but not as they be satisfactorie, or penall. Saint Paul (I say) reproueth this their vaine and vngrounded distinction, by the woorde (παθήματα) passions, afflictions, ot penalties. For hee sayeth, not the merites of this time, but the passions of this time, and that those passions of ours are vnwoorthy of the glorie to come: which poynte Durandus, Mayro, and Angelus perceiued righte well, and therefore woulde not in any wise admitte the treasure of Saintes, though they were great papistes all three. Their owne

Mark wel the word Passiõs

popish

popish glosse confesseth the same in the comment vppon the texte rehearsed, to wit, that our passions or satisfactions (as papists term them) are not worthy *si districte nobiscum ageretur*, if God should deale with vs according to iustice. But as the saide glosse addeth wisely, *facit spiritus quod merita non possunt*, the holy ghost supplieth that which wanteth in our merits. And their greate clarke Nicolaus Lyranus cannot deny the same, for these be his words: *Glossa interlin. ibidem.*

Ratio consistit in hoc, quod præmium excedit incomparabiliter meritum nostrũ in tolerantia passionum, propter quod patienter sunt meritò tolerandæ. *Lyranus in cap. 8. ad Rom*

The reason saieth Lyra, for which the apostle mooueth vs to beare patiently the afflictions of this worlde, consisteth chiefly in this, that the reward which God will bestow on vs, doth infinitly exceede the worthines of our afflictions, or the condignity of our passions: and for that respect, we ought worthily to indure them with patience. Neuertheless, Lyra would gladly haue our worke to be meritorious, and for that end he distinguisheth them as they proceed of free will, and as the holy Ghost worketh them, these are his words: *Lyranus vbi supra.*

Sciendum tamen, quod passiones istæ dupliciter possunt considerari: vno modo vt acceptantur à libero arbitrio, & sic loquitur hic apostolus: alio modo, prout spiritus sanctus mouens liberum arbitrium, est huius acceptionis principium: & sic est meritum de condigno, quia principium meriti est eiusdem dignitatis cum præmio.

We must know for all this saith Lyra, that our afflictions may be considred two waies: one way, as they are accepted and receiued from our free will: and so the apostle speaketh, when he saith, they be vnworthy. Another way, as the holy ghost mouing our free will, is the beginning of this acceptation. And so there is merite of condignity, because the beginning of merite, is of the same dignity with the reward. These are the wordes of Lyra, cited with all aduauntage for that cause, that he being once directly and fully confuted, all other papistes may be confuted in him: as who doubtles being all ioyned in one, can say no more then he hath done, in behalfe of their merites and supererogations. I therefore say first, that S. Paul affirmeth with me, that our afflictions or passions are not worthy the glory of heauen. Note wel the confutation of Lyra his distinction

I say secondly, that Lyra himselfe graunteth so much, as his owne words already alledged do witnesse.

I say thirdly, that their glosse is on my side.

I say fourthly, that if all were graunted which Lyra saith, yet would

it little or nothing helpe his purpoſe.

For firſt, our paſsions are no way ours, but as they proceede from our free will: *omnis enim actio humana eſt voluntaria:* yea ſo voluntaire, that as Saint *auguſtine* truely ſaith: if it were not voluntarie, it ſhould not be mans: and yet our afflictions or paſsions conſidered, as they proceed from our free will, are not worthie of the glorie to come by *Lyraes* owne graunt. Againe, when the Holy-ghoſt, and man worke both one and the ſame act: that which the Holi-ghoſt doth, can no more be reputed mans act, then that which man doth can be deemed Gods act. But ſo it is, that that which man doth cannot bee deemed the Holi-ghoſt deed: *ergo* neither that which doth the Holi-ghoſt, can be deemed mans deed. The aſſumption wherin conſiſteth the difficultie, (if there be any at all,) is proued by mans ſinfull actions. For the moſt cruel and wicked fact that can be imagined, is not done without the concourſe of the Holi-ghoſt, as al the learned Papiſts do and muſt confeſſe, and yet are mans ſinful acts ſo far from being deemed Gods acts, as the deformities and irregularities thereof be onely mans, and neuer Gods: and yet doth God concurre more to thoſe wicked actes, in that hee is principall agente of the reall and poſitiue entities of the ſame, then man doth or can concurre to any act of Gods: that is to ſay, to any good act that he himſelfe doth. For as S. *Iames* ſaith, euery good thing that man doth, is of God.

Thirdly, becauſe great abſurdities doe follow vpon this opinon, to wit, that many ſins freely remitted and forgiuen in this life, ſhould be puniſhed eternally in the world to come, greater then which, no abſurditie can be thought vpon, the reaſon of the conſequent is yeelded by *Thomas Aquinas, Dionyſius Carthuſianus, Dionyſius Areopagita*, and others. Who all do hold, (neither is holy writ diſſonant to their opinion,) that the deuils concurre if not to all, yet to the greater parte of ſinnes, committed in this life by ſinfull mortall men. Whereupon I inferre firſte, that the Deuils ſinnes are mans, and mans ſinnes the Deuils if *Lyraes* diſtinction were of force, the reaſon of the conſequence is euident, becauſe the Deuill and man doe both one and the ſelfe ſame acte.

I infer ſecondly, that the ſinnes forgiuen to penitent ſinners in this life, are puniſhed in the deuils world without end.

For what reply ſoeuer the aduerſary canne make, or what euaſion ſo euer he ſhall vſe in this point: the ſame can I make, and the ſame ſhall

I vse against himselfe, in the passions and merits of Saintes. Let what Papiste as will, begin when he will, to make trial therof. For no effectual disparitie doubtlesse, can euer be yeelded in that behalfe.

Another absurditie is, that God should hereby be the author or partaker of sinne. The reason hereof is euident, because as mans acts bee meritorius, for that Gods concurreth to them: in like manner Gods actes must bee demeritorious, for that man concurreth to the same: For God and man concurre no lesse, to that selfe same acte, whiche is sinne: then they doe to that acte, which the Papistes tearme of condigne merrite: that there is no comparison betweene mans desertes and glorie eternall, S. *Bede* sheweth pithilie & plainly in these words: *Beda in ca. 8 ad Rom.*

Ipse dicit qui patiebatur & sciebat pro quo nomine patiebatur, & quo fructu patiebatur: non sunt condignæ passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam, quæ revelabitur in nobis. appendo quod patior, contra id quod spero, hoc sentio: illud credo, & tamen plus valet quod credo, quam quod sentio.

He saith, who suffered, and who knew for whose sake hee suffered, and with what fruit he suffered: the sufferings of this life are not worthy of the future glorie, which shalbe reueled in vs. I weigh in the ballance that which I suffer, against that which I hope for, this I feel, that I beleeue, & yet that is of more force which I beleeue, thē that which I feele, yea as their owne *durand* telleth them, Christ himselfe could not satisfy in rigore iustitiæ as he was man, but only in respect of hipostaticall vnion: and therefore is it not impossible that satisfaction of pure man, I say of corrupt and sinfull man, shall by any way be equivalente or perfect: for as the Pppes deare monke *Dominicus Soto* granteth: *Durand. in 3 sent. dist. 20 & in 4. dist. 5*

Perfecta satisfactio est illa, cuius valor et pretium totū emanat a debitore, nulla vel preuenente vel interueniente gratia creditoris: taliter vt sit redditio aequalentis alias indebiti voluntaria. *Soto de nat. & grat. lib. 3. c 6*

Perfect satisfaction is that, whose valour and price wholly proceedeth from the debtour, without either preuentinge or interuentinge grace of the creditour: so as the reddition be of that, which is equiualent and not otherwise due. This is truely said of Soto, which *Aristoteles* perceiued by very natural discours, teaching that we cannot make condigne satisfaction to God and our parents. *Arist. lib. 8. ethic. cap. 7.* In the discription of our Frier *Soto*, we haue to note 4. things. First that the valoure of satisfaction muste proceede wholy from the debtour. Secondly, that there must bee no preuenting or interuenting grace of the creditour. Thirdly, that there must be equiualent restitution. Fourthly, that that

equi-

equivalent reddition must be a worke, otherwise not due, which four when any papist in the world, can proue to be in any satisfactiō made by pure man, (neither shall the Popes holinesse be excepted,) I will be a Papist once againe. For our satisfaction is so vnperfect indeed, as no one of the 4. condicions here required, can be found and approued therin. For first, what act soeuer proceedeth from our selues, as of our selus, is lothsom in gods sight, according to this saying of the prophet

Esay. 64, 6 וכבגד עדים כל־צדקתינו׃

All our righteousnes is as a filthy clout, nothing pure or cleane.

Secondly, what act soeuer proceedeth from vs without Gods preuenting grace, cannot posible be void of sin: for as the apostle saith:

2 Cor. 3, 5. *Non sumus sufficientes cogitare aliquid a nobis, quasi ex nobis, sed sufficienta nostra ex deo est.*

We are not able to think one good thought of our selues, as of our selues, but all and euery part of our sufficiency is of God.

And againe he saith:

1 Cor. 12, 4 *Nemo potest dicere dominus Iesus, nisi in spiritus sancto.*

No man can say Lord Iesu, but by the power of God.

We owe of dutie to God, more then posibly wee can euer performe, and therefore can not iustly, nay therfore cannot without the note of intollerable pride, smelling of more then pelagianisme, tearm any of our best workes, a worke not due to God, or a worke of super errogation. For Christ hath taught vs another lesson:

Luk. 7, v 10 *Cum feceritis omnia quæ precepta sunt vobis, dicite, servi inutiles sumus, quod debuimus facere fecimus.*

When ye haue done all things that are commanded you, say, we are vnprofitable seruants, we haue done that which we were bound to do.

Fourthly, concerning equiualent satisfaction, theyr owne Angelicall Doctour *Thomas Aquinas* shall answere them, whose very words are these

Aquin. in 3. p. q. 1 ar. 2. *Dicendum, quod aliqua satisfactio potest dici dupliciter sufficiens: vno modo perfectè, qua est condigna per quandam adæquationem ad recompensationem culpa commissæ, & sic hominis puri satisfactio sufficiens esse non potuit pro peccato; alio modo potest dici satisfactio hominis esse sufficiens imperfectè, scilicet secundum acceptationem eius, qui est ea contentus, quamvis non sit condigna. Et hoc modo satisfactio puri hominis est sufficiens.*

We must answere, that satisfaction may be called sufficient twoe waies: one way perfectly, because it is worthy by a certaine adequation

tion or equallitie to the compenſation of the faulte committed: and ſo this ſatiſfaction of pure man, cannot be ſufficient for ſinne. Another way vnperfectly, to wit, according to his acceptation who is content with it although it be not worthie: and this way the ſatisfaction of pure man is ſufficient.

Loe, here is a myſtery, for not ſufficient is ſufficient.

This is the anſwere of Aquinas, whoſe doctrine is confirmed for authenticall, by papall authoritie. Now marke it well, for Chriſtes loue. This greate doctour was ſo buſie to defende popiſh pardons, and the grounde or foundation of the ſame, (which is the ſupererogation of mannes deſerts, as we haue heard,) that he had no other ſhifte in the world, but to coyne a new no diſtinction of double ſufficient ſatisfaction; which diſtinction for all that, if I do not proue it to confute and make fruſtrate it ſelfe, I will deſire no credite of the reader.

The papiſts are infatuated, and ſay they know not what.

Satisfaction (ſaith Aquinas) may be called ſufficient, either becauſe it is indeed ſufficiēt, as which is an equivalent compenſation: or it may be called ſufficient, not becauſe it is equivalent and ſufficient indeed: but becauſe it is accepted and admitted, albeit it be not worthy.

Nowe I pray you, what can be more fooliſhly ſpoken, or more againſt a mans owne aſſertion? he would eſtabliſh a ſufficient ſatisfaction, and yet is inforced to acknowledge a ſatisfaction not ſufficient, but accepted as if it were ſufficiēt; which is the very ſame that I would neuer denie, and which ouerthroweth all popiſh doctrine. For it proueth indeed, that no workes of the regenerate are good and without ſinne, though they be accepted and imputed for good and without ſin: and conſequently, if the papiſts would be conſtant in their owne doctrine, we and they would ſoone agree. But what? doeth not our holy father the pope tell vs, that though Chriſt pardon a penitent ſinner, yet muſt he ſuffer temporall paine in purgatorie, and ſo to neede the popes pardons? Yes doubtleſſe as you haue heard, and the Pope and Papiſts glory in the ſame. And yet this notwithſtanding, if a man can get a plenarie pardon from the Pope for the houre of his death, he ſhall come to heauen with all ſpeed, and neuer once enter in at purgatorie gates. If any credite not my words, let him credite their Doctour *Sylueſter*, who writeth in this manner:

Qui plenariam indulgentiam ritè aſſecutus eſt, ſi eo inſtanti moreretur, euolaret ſtatim ad cœlum. *Sylueſter de indulg. par. 33*

He that hath lawfully gotten a plenary pardon, if hee ſhould die at that inſtant, ſhould incontinently goe to heauen. The Popes pardons

then, are so far from being such as they are preched to be: that they do not only not yeeld vs any remission of paine, but greatly increase our pain when we beleeue them: as which derogate no litle from Christs passion, and from the verity of his sacred word. For indeed saintes can no more satisfie for vs, then they can merite for vs: and yet dareth not *Dominicus Soto* auouch their merits for vs, though hee be the Popes doctor deare. For which cause wisely and grauely saith Augustine:

Soto in 4. sent. dist. 21. q. 1. ar. 2. prope fine

Va etiam laudabili vitæ hominum, si remota misericordia discutias eam.

Aug. lib. 9. confes. ca. 13.

Woe euen to the laudable life of men: if thou discusse and examine it, thy mercie set apart; which thing their own frier *Iohn de Combis* did well perceiue, when in his Theologicall abridgement he affirmeth it to be a maxime with God, euer to reward vs aboue our well doings, and to punish vs lesse then our euell demerits. His words be these:

Et hoc patet quia Deus semper remunerat supra meritum, sicut punit citra condignum.

Io. de Combis lib. 5. theol. ver. 1. cap. 11.

And this is euident, because God euer rewardeth aboue our merits, and punnisheth vs lesse then we be worthy. So then we see it manifest, that euen by popish doctrine, there is no place for popish pardons.

The sixt Conclusion.

POpes vsually giue many pardons, affirming most impudently in the same, that whosoeuer shal pray in such a manner, say masse ouer such reliques, visite such a Church, or contribute so much to such an ende, shall deliuer a soule from purgatorie; which kinde of pardons. *Pope Gregorie* graunted often during my abode at Rome: as to the bishop of Rosse in the behalfe of the Scottish Queene: to Stukeley, for the trecherous practises he should haue contriued against England, to *Alphonsius* the Iesuite, for the successe of English complots, and such like. This notwithstanding, these solemn and glorious pardons be nothing els, but mere fabulous and lying graunts.

For first, there is no purgatorie after this life as shall be proued hereafter, and consequently the pope can deliuer no soule from thence, though he graunt neuer so many pardons.

Matt. 16, 19. *Richard de Mediavilla in 4. sent. dist. 3. q. 3. dist. apud mag. 20. extra de pe. & re.*

Secondly, because to giue pardons is an act of Iurisdiction, as apeareth by the scripture which they alleadge. and consequently that act cannot be exercised but vpon the popes subiects, and therefore not vpon the souls in purgatorie, who are exempt from his iurisdiction. All which their owne schoole doctour *Richardus de Mediavilla* prooueth out of their cannon-law in these words:

In-

Indulgentiæ non prosunt illis qui non sunt de iurisdictione illius qui eas concessit, extra de pe. & re. illis autem qui sunt in purgatorio, non sunt sub iurisdictione prælatorum Ecclesiæ, quod satis datur intelligi, cum dixit dominus Petro: quodcunq; solueris super terram. Addendo enim super terram, videtur referre collationem huius potestatis tantum supervivientes hac vita mortali.

Pardons do not profit them, who are not of his iurisdictiō that granteth them: but they who are in purgatorie, be not vnder the iurisdiction of our prelates of the church, which is sufficiently giuen to be vnderstood, when our Lord said to Peter: (whatsoeuer thou shalt binde vpon earth:) for adding vpon earth, he seemeth to referre and extend this power, only to the liuing here on earth. Now, if answere be made as is vsed by the wiser sort of papists, that the Pope pardoneth in purgatorie onely by way of suffrage, then doe I reply, that, that is *petitio principii*, and that that kinde of pardoning is vncertain and fallible, and so still I haue my purpose. For the preachers of the pardons, and the pardons also tell vs: that whosoeuer visiteth such a church, saith masse at such an aultar, or contributeth to such an ende, shall deliuer a soule from purgatorie. And yet by way of suffrage no such thing can be assured, no more then when another deuout papist shall offer vppe his prayers for them, which thing seemed so to trouble Bellarminus, that in his written dictates he knoweth not wel what to hold or write, cōcerning Romish pardons. Thirdely, because the pope cannot applye Christs satisfaction more effectually to them by his pardoning, then the same is applied to them by the saying of masse, as which by popish religion is the selfe same sacrifice reallie, that was offered vppon the crosse: and yet do no papists say or thinke that once saying of masse, can or will deliuer his friendes soule from Purgatory. For otherwise, there would not be so many masses saide so many times for the selfe same persons as hath beene and is daily seene, amongst the papistes. For to this end doe they celebrate and obserue yearely anniuersaries, for soules departed 10. 20. 30. 40. 60. yeares before. Which the pope, cardinals, and monkes had taught the people to frequent, as most necessarie for their friendes soules in Purgatorie. Fourthlye, because it cannot be proued, that after God had pardoned our sinnes and the eternall paine due for the same, there still remaineth some temporall paine, remissible by the Popes pardons. Fiftly, because all the three things required of papists in popish pardoning, are most firm, certaine & ready, in the souls of purgatory: to wit, actority in the giuer, charity

in the receiuer, and the cauſe of pietie. For firſt the ſoules of Purgatorie be in charitie, as all Papiſts confeſſe: as who otherwiſe, coulde neuer be ſaued.

Secondly, it is meere cruelty not to helpe the faithfull in ſuch woful caſe. Thirdly, if they denie the Popes authoritie, I will willinglie denie it with them: though he accurſe me as he hath alreadie done, for my paines. For I nothing doubt, but God of his great mercie wil cõuert his curſe, to my greater ioy and bliſſe. And neere, becauſe the Seminaries neuer ceaſe to boaſt in corners amongſt the ſimple, that none in this Realme dareth to diſpute with them, I offer publike diſpute with what Seminarie in England ſoeuer hee be, no one or other excepted: ſo it may ſtande with the Honourable licence and good liking of higher powers, vvhoſe mindes I am of dutie bound to obaie in that behalfe. For I doubt not, if my opinion may be granted: but that it will tend to the glory of God, the ſeruice of my Soueraigne, the honour of my Countrie, the edification of the auditours, and the comfort of mine owne ſoule. The reaſon is, for that I knowe verie ſufficientlie, the foundations, groundes, auctorities and reaſons, of both ſides: and withall behold as in a glaſſe of Chriſtall, the euident confutation of all whatſoeuer can poſſiblie be ſaid in defence of Papiſtrie: which if I had not firſt ſeene, I had neuer departed from Popiſh doctrine.

Publike diſputation offered to the Papiſts.

The 7. Concluſion.

IF the Popes pardons be not of ſo great force, and worth ſo much as they are ſaide and preached to be: then is the Popes religion vaine and of no credite at all. This propoſition both is and muſt be granted of all Papiſtes, if they will defend their now profeſſed Romiſh Religion. *Thomas Aquinas* (whoſe doctrine and bookes diuers Popes haue approued for good and godly) writeth thus:

Aquin. in ſupplement. 3. p. q. 25. art. 2. in corpore.

Eccleſia prædicando indulgentias non mentitur, & ita tantum valent quantum prædicantur: ſicut enim dicit Auguſtinus, ſi in ſacra Scriptura deprehenderetur aliquid falſitatis, iam robur authoritatis ſacræ Scripturæ perit. Et ſimiliter ſi in prædicatione eccleſiæ aliqua falſitas deprehenderetur, non eſſent documẽta Eccleſiæ alicuius authoritatis ad roborandam fidem.

The church preaching Pardons doth not lie, and ſo they are worth no leſſe then they are preached. For as *Auguſtine* ſaieth, if in holye Scripture any falſhood be found, euen then the full authority of holy ſcripture periſheth vtterlie. And in like manner, if in the preaching

of

of the Churche any falſhoode ſhoulde be found, the doctrine of the Church ſhoulde not be of any force to eſtabliſh our faith. Theſe are the words of their canonized ſaint and renowned doctour Aquinas, which ſhew vnto vs ſo plainely, as more plainely nothing can be told: that if the Church of Rome erre in any one pointe, as in giuing pardons or ſuch like, then muſt we giue no credit to it in other points of religion. Neither is this the opinion of Aquinas onely, but their other great Thomiſt Diminicus Soto ſingeth the ſame ſong.
Theſe be his words.

Soto in 4. ſent. diſt. 21. q. 2 art. 1.

Alii dixerunt indulgentias nihil prorſus valere, niſi quantum vniſquiſque deuotione ſua faciendo quod indulgentia præcipit, mœretur. Attamen iſti ſeu blaſphemi non ſunt audiendi, ſanè qui authoritatem Eccleſiæ infringunt: ſi enim de hac re nos Eccleſia ſeduceret, nulla ei eſſet in reliquis adhibenda fides.

Some ſay that pardons were no more woorth at all, then euery man doth merite by his owne deuotion. But theſe fellowes are to bee reiected as blaſphemous, becauſe they infiinge the authoritie of the Church: for if the Church ſhould in this point ſeduce vs, then were there no credite to be giuen vnto it in other pointes. Theſe are the expreſſe wordes of the Popes owne and beſt Doctors, Aquinas, and Soto: whoſe teſtimonies, with that which is ſaid in other concluſions: diſable together the authority and religion of the Churche of Rome. For if the Church of Rome deceiue vs in her pardons, (as is ſufficiently prooued that ſhe hath done:) then is ſhe not to be credited in other thinges, as both *Aquinas* and *Soto* tell vs: whoſe doctrine the pope, yea ſundry Popes of Rome haue confirmed.

Marke this, that ſo ſoone as the church of Rome is confuted in any on point it is conſequently confuted in all the reſt.

THE COROLLARIE.

FIrſt therefore ſince the Popes pardons be fooliſh and repugnant to common ſence: Secondly, ſince the veritie and efficacie of pardons be ſo vncerten, as the beſt learned Papiſtes, cannot tell what to ſay or write thereof: Thirdly, ſince to giue pardons, as the Popes doth, is a ſtrange and new thing: as which, neither Chriſt, nor his Apoſtles euer taught or practiſed: Fourthly, ſince the Popes manner of pardoninge, (ordinarie popiſh practiſe conſidered) is moſt abſurd: Fiftly, ſince the Popes pardons in Romiſh doctrine, are reputed æquiualent with holy martyrdome: Sixtly, ſince the Popes pardons be not ſuch, nor ſo forcible, as they are preached to be: Seuently, ſince the foundation of Popiſh pardons, is blaſphemous and derogatorie to Chriſtes paſſion: Eightly, ſince the Pope taketh vp-

on

on him by his pardons, to deliuer soules from purgatorie which hee cannot performe: Nynthly, since *Aquinas*, *Soto*, and *Syluester*, his owne renowned Doctors doe affirme, that if the Pope preach falsely in his pardons, all his other doctrine is false and naught: I conclude, it is a sufficient motiue for me to renounce the Romish Religion, as false, erronious, and pernicious doctrine.

Thus much of the first Motive.

The thirde Chapter.

OF THE POPES MANNERS, Faith, and Religion.

ALbeit concerning Sanctimonie of life, and honest conuersation amonge men, the learned Papistes will not defende their Popes, whom they vse to terme by name of holinesse: yet do they all persist in this, that none of them can erre in their judiciall decrees, concerning either faith or maners: for better examination, whereof, I put downe certaine conclusions.

The 1 Conclusion.

THe liues and manners of Popes haue beene most wicked, most notorious, and most scandalous to the world. This conclusion I will onely prooue, by the testimonies of great Romish doctors, that so my words may be of better credit therein. Heare therefore what *Bartholomaus Carranza* writeth of them.

Carranza in summa Conc. fol. 354. & fol 355.

Stephanus Sextus magno odio persecutus est nomen Formosi, cuius & ordinationes omnes rescidit & damnavit: iam enim tunc cœperat Pontificum & virtus & integritas desinere.

Pope Stephanus the sixt persecuted the verie name of Formosus, all whose ordinations, or giuing of orders, he disanulled and condemned: for euen then began, the vertue and integritie of Popes to faile.

Romanus vniuersa acta Stephani improbat & abrogat.

Pope *Romanus* doth reproue and abrogate, the whole actes of pope Stephanus.

Lo, the popes owne deare Doctor, can not deny errors to be in the church of Rome.

Sergius Tertius Formosi nomen prosequitur, cuius corpus humatum truncari capite iussit. Res plena horroris, vt videas quantum degenerabant Pontifices à maioribus suis: ne cui mirum sit, interim si qui abusus & peruersæ opiniones in Ecclesiam irrepserunt.

Pope Sergius the third doth persecute the name of *Formosus*, whose body after it was buryed, he commaunded to be beheaded. A thing

verie doleſull, that thou mayſt ſee how much the Popes in theſe daies did degenerate from their anceſtors: leaſt any maruell if in the meane time, abuſes and peruerſe opinions be crept into the Church.

Iohannes 13. venationibus, magis quàm orationibus vacabat: & multa alia auditu indigna de eo dicuntur.

Pope Iohn the thirteenth was more addicted to hunting, then to prayer: and many vnworthie factes are reported of him. This is the cenſour of Bartholomæus Carranza, a learned Thomiſt, and Dominican Fryer: and therefore hath he not ſaide more againſt the Popes of Rome, then the force of verity induced him vnto. *Platina* affirmeth no leſſe then *Carranza*, of the wicked liues of Popes: but I will onely alledge one place or two, ommitting all the reſt for breuitie ſake.

Nihil enim aliud hi Pontifices cogitabant, quàm & nomen & dignitatem maiorum ſuorum extinguere. *Platina in vita Rom. primi. pag. 147.*

For theſe Popes went about no other matter, but onely how to extinguiſh the name and dignity of their anceſtors. And in another place the ſaid *Platina* writeth thus:

Vide quæſo, quantùm iſti degenerarunt à maioribus ſuis, illi enim vtpote viri ſanctiſſimi, dignitatem vltrò oblatam contemnebant, orationi & doctrinæ chriſtianæ vacantes: hi verò largitione & ambitione pontificatum quærentes, & adepti, poſthabito diuino cultu, inimicitias non ſecùs ac ſæuiſſimi quidam tyranni inter ſeſe exercebant: ſuus poſteà voluptates ſecuriùs expleturi, cùm nullibi extarent qui eorum vitia coercent. *Platina in vita Sergii. 3. Pag. 148*

Behold I pray thee, how much theſe biſhoppes do degenerate from their aunceſtors: for they as moſt holy men, contemned dignity offered them, giuing themſelues to prayer and Chriſtian doctrine: but theſe Popes, ſeeking and attaining their Popedomes by bribes and ambition (Gods diuine worſhip ſet aſide) did exerciſe enmities amõg themſelues, as moſt cruell tyrants: thinking after to enioy their pleaſures more ſecurely, when there ſhould be none to reproue their Vices. Thus ſaith *Platina* a very learned Papiſt, who was *Abbreuiatur Apoſtolicus* to the Church of Rome.

The 2. Concluſion.

MAny Popes haue aſpired vnto Popedome, by moſt naughtie and vngodlie meanes. Pope *Chryſtophorus* the firſt, ſhall firſt beginn this proofe, of whom thus writeth *Platina*:

Chriſtophorus, cuius patria & cognomentum ob ignobilitatem ignoratur pontificatum malis artibus adeptus, malè amiſit: ſeptimo enim menſe dignitate *platina in vita Chriſt. primi.*

tate ac meritò electus, monasticam vitam vnicum calamitosorum refugium e-bire cogitur.

Pope *Chrystopher*, whose country and sir-name by reason of his baseneſſe is not knowne, came naughtilie by his Popedome, and lost it as naughtily. For before the seuenth moneth was fullie expired, he was depriued of his Pontificall dignitie, and inforced to be a Monke, the sole and onely refuge of all distressed persons. *Carranza* reporteth this to be true, which *Platina* hath set downe. Pope Bonifacius the seauenth and *Sylvester* the second, aspired to their Popedomes by Necromancie, and Diabolicall meanes. *Sylvester* the thirde, attained his Popedome by sedition: and *Damasus* the second was made Pope by violent meanes, without consent either of Cleargie, or people. This to bee so, vvitnesseth both *Platina* and *Carranza*. And *Platina* addeth these words:

Carranza in summa conciliorum, fol. 354.

Eo enim tum Pontificatus deuenerat, vt qui plus largitione & ambitione, non dico sanctitate vitæ & doctrina valeret, is tantum modo dignitatis gradum bonis oppressis & reiectis obtineret, quem morem vtinam aliquando non retinuisset nostra tempora.

Platina in vita Siluestri 3.

For to that passe was Popedome now brought, that vvho so coulde more in giuing Bribes, and in ambition, (I say not in good life & doctrine,) he onlie should haue the degree of honour, and good menne should be reiected: which custome, would to God, it had neuer been in our time kept. And the saide *Platina* saith in another place:

Adeo enim inoleuerat hic mos, vt iam cuiq; ambitioso licerat, Petri sedem invadere.

Platina in vita Damasi 2.

For this custome did so increase, that novv euery ambitious fellow, might inuade Peters seat or chayre. *Gregory* the fift was by Sedition thrust out of his throne, and Pope Iohn 18. by tyranny occupyed the Popedome: so sayth *Carranza* and *Platina*. Yea, Platina proceedeth further, and saith thus:

Carranza vbi supra fol. 355. platina in vita Ioan. 18.

Qua quidem beatitudine Ioannes caruit, fur certè in Pontificatu, & latro: non enim vt par fuerat, per ostium intrauit.

Which happy life Pope *Iohn* wanted, as who was a theese and a robber: for he entred not in by the dore, as he ought to haue done. And to be briefe, Pope *Bonifacius* 8. shall sound the trumpet for al the rest, of whom thus writeth Carranza: *Intrauit vt vulpes, regnauit vt lupus, mortuus est vt Canis.* He entred as a Fox, he reigned as a Wolfe, he died as a Dog. Thus he did, and thus he liued after he had gottē his Popedome by deceitfull meanes, as is already proued.

Carranza vbi supra fol. 369

The 3. Concluſion.

POpes may not only erre, and hold falſe opinions, but alſo becom moſt notorious heretickes, and for their hereſies, be depriued of their Popedomes. This concluſion may be proued, both by the teſtimonies of great learned papiſtes, and alſo by the flat Decrees of many Popes. *Dominicus Soto* hath theſe words:

Soto in 4. ſent. diſt. 22. q. 2. ar. 2.

Quamvis Papa, vt Papa errare non poſſit, hoc eſt, ſtatuere errorem nequeat tanquam articulum fidei, quia ſpiritus ſanctus id non permittet: tamen vt ſingularis perſona errare in fide poteſt, ſicut alia peccata committere.

Albeit the Pope as Pope cannot erre: that is to ſaye, cannot ſette downe anie errour as an article of our faith, becauſe the Holi-ghoſte will not that permit: neuertheles, as he is a priuate perſon ſo may he erre euen in faith, as he may do other ſinnes: and for full proſe of this point, only *Sylueſter Prieras* is ſufficient, who albeit he extol the popes power aboue kings, and Emperors, and Angels in heauen their autoritie; yet doth he confeſſe, that our holy father the pope, *in caſu hæreſis*, both may be iudged and depoſed: yea, this point is very manifeſt in manie texts of the Popiſh canon law, for in one place it is thus written: *Oves, quæ ſuo paſtori commiſſa ſunt, eum nec reprehendere, niſi à fide exorbitauerit, nec vllatenus accuſare poſſunt.*

Sylueſter in papa. Par. 4.

2. Quæſt. 7 cap. Oues.

The ſheepe that are committed to (the Pope) their Paſtor, neither can reproue him, nor any waie accuſe him: vnleſſe hee ſhall ſwarue from the faith. In another place it is ſaide, that though the Pope bee neuer ſo wicked (though he carry thouſands with himſelfe headlong to hell) yet muſt no man iudge him, vnleſſe he be an hereticke.

Quia cunctos ipſe iudicaturus, à nemine eſt iudicandus, niſi deprehendatur à fide devius. Becauſe (ſaith the Popes law) he muſt iudge al, and none iudge him, vnleſſe he be found to haue forſaken the faith. *Ioſephus Angles*, in his booke which he dedicated to the Pope himſelfe, confirmeth this matter in theſe words:

Diſt. 43. cap. ſi Papa.

Papa hæreticus vt apoſtata, ab vniuerſali Concilio deponi poteſt: & ratio eſt, quia ſicut nullus poteſt eſſe alicuius religionis prælatus, qui non ſit in illa religione profeſſus: ita neq; poteſt eſſe Papa, ſi fide eccleſiæ careat.

Ioſeph. Angl. in 4. ſent. part. 2. quaſt. de excom. art. 4. diffic. 1.

The Pope being an hereticke, as alſo an Apoſtata, may be depoſed by a generall Councell: and the reaſon is, becauſe as none can bee a prelate of anie Religion, which is not profeſſed in that Religion: ſo neither can he be Pope, that holdeth not the faith of the Church.

The 4 Concluſion.

MAny Popes haue de facto forſaken the Chriſtian faith, and becom flat heretickes. This proportion, though it ſeeme ſtrange to many, ſhalbe proued (God willing effectually, and that by the expreſſe teſtimonies of great Popiſh doctors. For it is ſo certen, that Pope Honorius was an hereticke, as their eight ſolemne Councell holden at Conſtantinople, cannot deny the ſame. Melchior Canus giueth this ſentence of the ſaid Honorious:

8 Conc. Conſtant. act. 7
Canus de locis Theol. lib. 6. cap. vlt.

At Honorium quomodo ab errore vindicabit? quem hæreticum fuiſſe tradit Pſellus in carmine de ſeptem ſynodis, Tharaſius ad ſummos Sacerdotes Antiochiæ, Alexandriæ, ſanctæ vrbis, vt ſeptima Synodo act. 3. ſcriptum eſt: Theodoſius cum ſynodo ſua Hieroſolymitana, in confeſſione fidei quæ habetur eadem actione 3. Epiphanius reſpondens hæreticis in conſpectu Concilij eiuſdem Act. 6. Tota demùm ipſa ſeptima ſynodus actione vltima, & in Epiſtola ad omnes ſacerdotes & Clericos. But howe will Pyghius deliuer Pope Honorious from errour? whome to haue bene an hereticke, witneſſeth *Pſellus*, in his verſes of the ſeuen ſynods: Tharaſius to the partriarks of *Antioch*, of *Alexandria*, and of the holy Cittty, as is written in the 7. Synode: Theodoſius with his Synode at Hieruſalem, in the confeſſion of their faith: *Epiphanius* anſwering to the hereticks, in the ſight of the ſaid Counſell: finally, the ſeuenth Synode wholly in the laſt action, & in their Epiſtle to all prieſts and Clergie men. *Viguerius* holdeth for a conſtant poſition, that Pope *Anaſtaſius* erred in an article of the faith: his words be theſe:

Viguerius de virtute fidei cap 10. p 3. verſ. 13.

Si dicamus, quòd ſummus Pontifex errare poteſt, & in animo ſuo concipere aliquem articulum orthodoxæ fidei contrarium, & etiam priuatim proferre, vt legitur de Anaſtaſio 2. dicendum, quòd ſummus Pontifex, vt priuata perſona errare poteſt, non tamen vt eſt ſummus Pontifex.

If we ſay the Pope may erre, and conceiue in his mind ſome article contrary to the Catholike faith, and pronounce the ſame alſo priuately: anſwere muſt be made, that the Pope may erre as a priuate perſon, but not as he is Pope. *Nicolaus Lyranus* vtterreth this matter ſo plainly, as no man can long ſtand in doubt therof: theſe be his words:

As we read of Anaſtaſius

Lyr. in cap. 16 Matt.

Ex quo patet, quòd Eccleſia non conſiſtit in hominib. ratione poteſtatis, vel dignitatis, eccleſiaſtice, vel ſecularis, quia multi principes, & ſummi Pontifices & alij inferiores, inventi ſunt apoſtataſſe à fide: propter quod Eccleſia conſiſtit in illis perſonis, in quibus eſt notitia vera, & confeſſio fidei, & veritatis.

Whereby it is euident, that the Church doth not conſiſt in men, by reaſon of power or dignity, either eccleſiaſticall or ſecular: becauſe many Princes, and Popes, and other of the inferior ſorte, are founde

to haue ſwarued from their faith: for which cauſe the Church conſiſteth in thoſe perſons, in whom there is true knowledge, and confeſſion of the faith, and verite. Loe, the iudgment of their owne Doctor: not they that ſit in S. Peters chaire, are the true and lawfull ſucceſſors of *S. Peter:* but they that confeſſe, and preach *S. Peters* faith and doctrine. We therfore impugne nothing in Popiſh proceedings, but the ſelfe ſame, which Popiſh Doctors reproued before vs: and that in their publike writings, publiſhed to the world.

Vaine is Popiſh ſucceſsion, whereof they boaſt ſo much.

The 5. Concluſion.

MAny Popes haue erred, in their publique doctrin of faith and maners. Pope *Iohn* the 22. of that name, as witneſſeth *Okam, Eraſmus, Alphonſus, Adrianus,* & others, taught the people that the ſoules of the iuſt doe not ſee God, before the reſurrection: yea *Gerſon* that great Popiſh doctor, (who ſometime was Chauncellor of *Paris,*) affirmeth this matter in theſe expreſſe words:

Hoc fecit latroni qui veriſimiliter nondum compleuerat pœnitentiam pro omnibus peccatis ſuis, qui fuit illa hora propria beatificatus, & vidit Deum facie ad faciem, ſicut ſancti in Paradiſo: propter quod inſuper apparet falſitas doctrinæ Papæ Iohannis 22. Quæ damnata fuit cum ſono buccinarum coram Rege Philippo per Theolog. Pariſien. & credidit potius theolog. Pariſienſ. quã curiæ. *Io. Gerſon. in ſer. de paſch. tom. 1*

This he did to the thiefe, (which by likelihood had not yet accompliſhed pennance for all his ſinnes,) who was bleſſed in that very houre, and ſawe God face to face, as doe the Saintes in Paradiſe: by reaſon whereof, further appeareth the falſhood of the doctrine of Pope *Iohn,* which was condemned by the ſound of trumpets before *K. Philip* by the deuines of Paris, and the King beleeued rather the deuines of *Paris,* then the court. In which words, we haue to note firſt, that *Gerſon* auoucheth the thiefe, crucified with Chriſt, to haue ſeene God face to face in that houre, & ſo to be bleſſed. Secondly, that he reproueth the falſe doctrin of Pope *Iohn,* Thirdly, that his doctrine was condemned with the ſound of trumpets, in the preſence of the king of Frãce. Fourthly, the K. gaue more credit to the deuines of Paris, then to the iudgement of the Court of Rome. Fiftly, that neither the King nor the lerned papiſts, did at that time grant ſuch athority to the Pope, as now the Pope challengeth, wherupon it followeth conſequently, that the pope alſo raught falſ doctrin in a waighty matter of faith: which thing not onely *Gerſon* affirmeth, as you haue heard: but pope *Adriã* himſelf teſtifieth ỹ ſame, as recordeth ỹ zelous papiſt *Alphonſus* in theſe words

of pope Iohn

Sexta hæresis docet nullam animam ante diem iudicii esse beatam, quum (vt ait) nulla anima ante illum diem videt Deum. Huius hæresis auctores sunt Armeni, eandem etiam tuentur Græci, post istos surrexit Iohannes 22. huius nominis pontifex. Sed ne verbis meis aliquis in hac parte deroget, verba Adriani papæ referam, qui in suo 4. sententiarum in calce eiusdem quæstionis de sacramento confirmationis, ita ait: Nouissimè fertur de Ioanne 22. quòd publicè docuit, declarauit, & ab omnibus teneri mandauit, quod animæ purgatæ ante finale iudicium non habent stolam, quæ est clara & facialis visio Dei: & aniuersitatem Parisiensem ad hoc induxisse dicitur, quod nemo in ea poterat gradum in Theolog. adipisci, nisi primitus hunc errorem iurasset se defensurum, & perpetuò ei ad hæsurum, hæc Adrianus.

Alph. de Cast. lib. 3. aduersus hæreses prope finem.

The sixt heresie teacheth no soule to be in blisse, before the day of Iudgement, because (as it saith) no soule before that day seeth God. The Armenians are the Authors of this heresie, and the Greekes hold the same. After these rose vp Pope Iohn the 22. of that name. But least any man distrust my words in this point, I will recite the wordes of Pope *Adrian*, who in his fourth booke of Sentences in the ende of a certaine question of the sacrament of confirmation, sayth thus: Last of all, it is reported of Pope Iohn the 22. that he publikelie taught, declared, and commaunded all men to hold, that the soules of the iust, before the day of Iudgement, haue not the stole which is the cleare and facely vision of God. And he is reported to haue induced the vniuersitie of *Paris* to this: that no man could take degree in the same, but he that first did sweare to defend this error, and to adhere vnto it for euer. Thus saith *Adrian*, who was himselfe Pope of Rome: and thus reporteth *Alphonsus* a Popish Fryer. And it will not helpe to say, as *Bellarminus* doth in defence of Popish faith: to wit that Pope Iohn erred as a priuate man, but not as Pope: for that distinction doth not onlie want a good foundation, whereupon it should be built, but also it flatlie destroyeth the plain text: the reason is euident to euery child. First, because Adrian saith, *Docuit*, he taught. Secondly, because hee saith, *Publicè* publikely. Thirdly, because he saith, *mandauit*, he commanded all to hold it. Fourthly, because none could be made graduate, which held not this opinion. Fiftly, because euerie graduate did sweare to defend it, and to hold it for euer. So then the pope may erre in publike decree of Faith, aswell as another man. And that, euen by the consent of *Adrian*, who was Pope himselfe: yea, who for learning and knowledge, was one of the rarest Popes that euer was at Rome.

Canus

Canus telleth vs, that *Gerſon*, *Almain*, and *Thomas Waldenſis*, do al hold that the Pope may erre, as is ſaid. Pope *Celeſtine* erred not only as a priuate man (but euen as Pope and publik perſon) in his publike decree of matrimonie. This to be ſo, witneſſeth the ſaid *Alphonſus*, in theſe very words: *Cœleſtinum papam erraſſe circa matrimonium fidelium, quorum alter labitur in hæreſim, res eſt omnibus manifeſta. neque hic Cœleſtini error talis fuit, qui ſoli negligentiæ imputari debuit, ita vt illum erraſſe dicamus, velut priuatam perſona, & non vt papam, qui in qualibet re ſeria definienda conſulere debet viros doctos: quoniam huiuſmodi Cœleſtini definitio habebatur in antiquis decretalibus, in cap. laudabilem, titulo de converſ. infidelium: quam ego ipſe vidi, & legi.* That Pope Celeſtine erred about matrimonie of the faithfull, whereof th'one is fallen into hereſie, is a thing ſo manifeſt as all menne knowe the ſame: neither was this error of Celeſtine ſuch, as it ought to be imputed to negligence, ſo as we may thinke him to haue erred as a priuate man, and not as Pope, who ought in the decree of euery ſerious matter, to ask councel of lerned men: for that definition of Celeſt. was in the old decretals, in the ch. *laudabilem*, and in the title *de converſionem infidelium*, which I my ſelfe haue ſeene and read. By this aſſertion of Alphonſus, it is cleare that Pope Celeſtine erred in the decree of faith. For firſte hee ſaith, that Celeſtine erred, not as a priuate man, but as a Pope, and as a publike perſon. Secondly, hee called it the decree of a ſerious matter. Thirdly, he termed it a definition, enrolled in the Popes decretals. He therefore erred, as a publike perſon, in the publike definition and decree of faith. Pope Nicholas the 1. taught baptiſme giuen onlie in the name of Chriſt to bee of force and good, which is not only an error, but a flat hereſie, neither wil it help the Papiſts, to ſay as Bellarminus doeth, that the Pope did not define any thing, but onely uttered his owne opinion as a priuate Doctour. For if they will denie the Popes publike reſolutions ſet down in their own Canon Lawe, to be decrees and definitions: they may with as good reaſon call white blacke, and blacke white: good euill, and euil good: and ſay the Pope cannot erre indeed in their ſenſe. But let vs examine the Popes words, who writeth thus, as is to be ſeene in their owne law: *A quodam Iudæo neſcitis vtrum chriſtiano an pagano, multos in patria veſtra baptizatos aſſertis, & quid de iis ſit agendum conſulitis: hi profecto ſi in nomine S. trinitatis, vel tantum in Chriſti nomine, ſicut in actibus apoſtolorum legimus baptizati ſunt (vnum quippe idemq; eſt vt ſanctus exponit Ambroſius) conſtat eos non eſſe denuo baptizandos.*

Alphonſ. lib. 1 cap. 4. aduerſ. hæreſes.

Of Pope Celeſtine.

Of Pope Nicholas.

de conſecrat. dist. 4. cap. 2. quodã Iudæo.

You

You say, many in your countrey were baptized of a Iew: but yee know not whether that *Iew* be a Christian or a pagan, & ye ask counsell of me, what is to be done in that case, doubtles they must not be rebaptized, if they were baptized either in the name of the holy trinitie, or onely in the name of Christ, as we read in the actes of the Apostles: for it is all one, as saith S. Ambrose. *Bellarminus* confesseth this sentence of Nicholas to be false indeed, but he denieth it to bee heretical, because the Church, that is, the pope hath not so defined it. Which answere of *Bellarminus*, doeth not defende that prerogatiue in decrees of faith, which the pope challengeth vnto himselfe.

For first, this was a publique decree, because the Bulgarians asked the popes iudgement, as appeareth by the word *(consultis)* yee require my counsell.

Secondlie, he erred herein, as *Bellarminus* is inforced to graunt, and consequently in his publique decree.

Thirdly, this his decree was contrary to the Gospell, as Pope *Pelagius* defineth in the said canon law, and therefore is *Bellarminus* his distinction friuolous when he granted the Popes definition to be false, but not hereticall: as if forsooth an opinion repugnant to Christs gospell, cannot be hereticall, vnlesse the popes holinesse so appoint it.

Fourthly, it is enough that the pope erred in his decree of faithe, whether they graunt it to be hereticall or no.

Fiftly, pope *Pelagius*, pope Zacharie, and a prouincial counsell of England holden in time of papistry, haue decreed his sentence to be hereticall, Pope *Pelagius* hath these words:

De consecr. di. 4. cap. multi. *Multi sunt qui in nomine solum modo christi, vna etiam mersione se asserunt baptizare. euangelicum vero præceptum ipso deo & domino saluatore nostro Iesu Christo tradente, nos admonet in nomine trinitatis, trina etiam mersione, sanctum baptisma vnacuiq; tribuere.*

There be many that say, they baptize onely in the name of Christ, with one mersion also: but the commaundement of the Gospell deliuered by God himselfe, and our sauior Iesus Christ, doth aduertise vs to baptize euery one in the name of the trinitie, with three mersions. Pope *Zacharie* hath these words:

De consecr. dist 4. cap in synod *In synodo Anglorum decretum & iudicium firmissime præceptum, et diligenter demonstatũ esse dignoscitur: vt quicunq; sine invocatione trinitatis mersus fuisset, sacramentum regenerationis non haberet. quod omnino verum est, quia si lotus in fonte baptismatis quis fuerit sine invocatione trinitatis, perfectus christianus*

ſtianus non eſt, niſi in nomine patris, & filij, & ſpiritus ſancti fuerit baptizatus hoc quoque obſeruari in prædicta ſynodo ſacerdotes voluerunt vt qui vel vnam de trinitate perſonam in baptiſmo non nominaret, illud baptiſma eſſe verum non poſſet, quod pro certo verum eſt, quia qui vnam ex ſancta trinitate confeſſus non fuerit, perfectus chriſtianus eſſe non poteſt.

It is well knowne that it was decreed in a councel of England, and that iudgement was giuen moſt conſtantly, and exactly proued, that whoſoeuer was baptized without the inuocation of the trinity, hee could not haue the ſacrament of regeneratiõ: which is altogither true: becauſe, if that any ſhalbe waſhed in the fountaine of baptiſme, without the inuocation of the trinity: he is no perfect chriſtian, vnleſſe he be baptized in the name of the father, and the ſon, and of the Holyeghoſt. This alſo the prieſts in that ſynod would haue obſerued, that who ſo ſhould omit but one perſon of trinity in baptiſme, that baptiſm could not be true, which thing is true for certainety: becauſe, he that ſhall not confeſſe one perſon of the trinitye, cannot bee a perfect chriſtian, by which teſtimonies being not onely of popes, but of Engliſh papiſts alſo aſſembled in counſel, we haue to note 2. things: the one, that the reſolution of pope *Nicholas* was a publique decree, and no priuat opinion: the other, that his decree was falſe, erroneus, and contrary to the goſpel of Chriſt Ieſus. *Ioſephus* Angles, a learned popiſh Frier, in a booke dedicated to the pope, ſheweth this whole matter diſtinctly in theſe words. *Si baptiſmus modo in nomine Chriſti tãtum, vel ſanctiſſi. trinitatis implicite conferatur, nõ erit ſacramentũ. definita eſt à Gelaſio papa in canone ſi re vera, & in canone ſi multi, vbi dicũtur agere contra præceptum euangelicũ ſic baptizantes, & baptiſmũ eſſe reiterandum.* If Baptiſme this day bee giuen in the name of Chriſt onely, or in the name of the holy trinity, but not expreſly, it ſhal not be the ſacrament of baptiſme, this is defined by pope *Gelaſius* in the canon *ſi re vera*, and in the canon *ſi multi*, where they are ſaid to do againſt the precept of Chriſtes Goſpel, that baptiſe in that maner, and that their baptiſm muſt be iterated and done againe, in fine, it is wonderfull and almoſt incredible, what groſſe, ſhameful, and vnchriſtian conſtitutions many popes haue made, aſwel in decrees of faith as of manners. But I furceaſing from recitall of huge numbers, wil content my ſelfe with onely 3. to wit, *Stephanus* the ſixth, *Iohn* the Nynth, and *Sergius* the Thirde. For firſt, pope *Stephanus* made fruſtrate and of none effect or purpoſe, the Orders receiued and allowed of Pope *Formoſus* his predeceſſour, but ſhortlye after

Ioſeph. Angli. de forma bap. ar. 2. 4 conſl. 3

Platina in vit. pontificum.

after al this, Pope Sergius vndid againe the acts of Pope Formosus & of Pope Iohn, & approued the actes of Pope *Stephanus* the sixt. These shamefull and erroneus constitutions and factes of these three Popes are so true, as not only *Baptista Platina*, a graue popish historiographer, but *Carranza* also, yea and *Bellarminus* himself do al confesse the same.

Argumentum ad hominem.

Wherin we haue first to consider, that amongst the Papists order is an holy sacramant and impresseth in the receiuer, an indelible character: by vertue whereof once a bishop must euer be a bishop by Popish doctrine, how soeuer iurisdiction bee taken awaye: and consequently, since *Formosus* was once a bishop: to wit, episcopus *Portuensis* as saith *Platina*: and by vertue thereof had their indelible character and power to giue orders: it was a most manifest errour in faithe, and most wicked fact in manners, to decree as Pope *Stephanus*, and Pope *Sergius* did: that orders giuen by Pope *Formosus* were not true orders, but none at all: and thereupon to commaund with the notorious scandal of all the world, that all such as were made priestes by him should take orders againe, as if they had beene of the meere laicall order.

Wher is now their character *indelibilis?*

The 6. Conclusion.

NOt onely the Pope as Pope may erre in his publike decrees, when he alone defineth matters of faith or manners: but also when he so defineth, with a 'prouinciall Romish counsell. This conclusion is certaine and vndoubtedly true, euen by the testimonies of best learned Papists. And because Bellarminus doth not deny this to be so, I will alleage his words which be these:

Secunda opinio est, pontificem etiam vt pontificem, posse esse hereticum, & docere hæresim, si absq; generali concilio defineat, & de facto aliquando accidisse. hanc opinionem sequitur & tuetur Nilus in suo libro aduersus primatum papæ. eandem sequuti sunt aliquot Parisienses, vt Gerson, & Almain in libris de potestate ecclesiæ, nec non Alphonsus de Castro libro primo, capit. 2. contra hæreses, & Adrianus sextus papa in quæstione de confirmatione: qui omnes non in pontifice sed in ecclesia, siue in concilio generali tantum, constituunt infallibilitatem iudicii de rebus fidei.

Bellarminus lib. 4. de Rom. pōtifice cap. 2.

Loe the doctrine of the best learned papistes is good, and altogether against the Popedome.

The second opinion is, that the Pope euen as Pope, may bee an heretique, and teach heresie: if he define without a generall counsell: and that this hath in very deede sometime chaunced so. This opinion doth Nilus follow and defend, in his Booke against the Popes primacie. The same opinion haue some of the Vniuersitie of Paris followed, as Gerson and Almain, in their bookes of the churches power, and

of

of their opinion are alſo *Alphonſus*, and Pope Adrian: who al do not aſcribe the infallibilitie of iudgment to the Pope, but to the Churche or to a generall Councell onely, in all matters of fayth: Out of which words I note:

Firſt, that the Pope as Pope may erre when he alone decreeth anye matter of Faith.

Secondly, I note that the Pope, as Pope may erre, when he defineth any matter of Faith without a generall councell: and conſequētly, that he may erre with a Prouinciall councell.

Thirdly I note, that Popes as Popes, that is as publike perſons, haue erred already, and *de facto:* when they haue decreed without a general Councell.

Fourthly I note, that all this is teſtified by foure great learned Papiſts, whereof one was Pope himſelfe.

Theſe teſtimonies are important, doubtleſſe, and very ſufficient to ſtabliſh my concluſion. But I will alledge yet another proofe, ſo excellent, ſo euident, and ſo irrefragable, as more cannot bee wiſhed. The proſe ſtandeth thus.

Pope *Stephanus*, with a counſell of all the Biſhops and prieſts of Itahe, defined flatlie againſt rebaptization, which decree of Councell with the popes aſſent thereto: S. *Cyprian* contemned, after it defending his former opinion conſtantlie, yea he was ſo far from acknoledging that prerogatiue in Popes, which they of latter daies challenge vnto themſelues, that he would not take Pope Stephanus for his ſuperiour, or to haue any iuriſdiction ouer him, but termed him. *ſuperbū & cæcæ ac praua mentis*, proud, ignorant, blind and naughtie, as is euident to ſuch as read his epiſtle to Pompeius. Out of which I note:

Firſt, that *Cyprian* was an holy martyr, & now a ſaint in heauen.

I note ſecondly, that he was a verie auncient father and a uery great learned clearke.

Thirdlie I note, that he knew what the Pope and his Councell had decreed,

I note fourthly, that he iudged a Romiſh councell to be of no greater force than a Councell *Afrycan*.

Fiftly I note, that he iudged the councell of Italie to be of no greater force for the Popes conſent, then was the councel of Afrike for his owne conſent. I note ſixtly, that prouinciall Councels are of no greater authoritie for the Popes confirmation, than for the confirmation

of another bishop: all which points are necessarily deduced out of S. *Cyprians* fact, and writings. And *Bellarminus* answer hereunto is friuolous, and not worth the rehearsall. The Pope defined not the controuersie as a matter of faith (saith *Bellarminus*) because he did not excomunicate S. *Cyprian*: A sweet dish of a messe of mustard. The Pope vtterly disliking S. *Cyprian* his opinion, and deeming it repugnant vnto Christs gospell, and for that end convocating all the cleargy men of Italy, did define the controuersie, but not as a matter of faith, saith *Bellar.* The controuersie was about rebaptization which was either flatly with the gospell, or flatly against the same. If it were flatly with the Gospel, then erred the Pope and his councell egregiously: If it were against the Gospell, and the Pope decreed it, then decreed he against it, as against a matter of faith, or else opinions against the Gospell are not against faith.

Bellarm. lib. 4. de rom. pont. cap. 7.

Bellarminus is confuted.

THE COROLLARIE.

First therefore, since the Popes liues haue been most wicked, notorious, and scandalous to the world: 2. since Popes haue aspired to the Popedome by vngodly means: thirdly, since Popes may not only err, and hold false opinions, but also become heretikes, and for their heresies be depriued of their Popedoms: 4. since many Popes haue *de facto* forsaken the christian faith, and becom flat heretiks: fiftly, since many Popes haue erred in their publike doctrin of faith and manners: sixtlie since not only the Pope, as he is P. may er in his publike decrees, whē he alone defineth matters of faith and maners, but when he so defines with a prouinciall councell: I conclude it is a sufficient motiue for me to renounce the romish religion, as false, erroneous, & pernitious doct.

Thus much of the second Motive.

The fourth Chapter.

Of the authority of generall Councels in these our daies.

I Haue sometimes had the decrees of generall Councels, aswell later as former in great admiration, thinking them the determinations and resolutions of the holy-Ghost: but of late yeares I haue chaunged my opinion vpon sundry waighty Motives, the chiefest whereof I will set down by way of conclusions.

The first Conclusion.

The

THe decrees of generall Councels in theſe latter daies are nothing elſe but meere mockery and ſophyſtical ſubtletie, to deceiue gods people withall. For although there be before euery general councell, ſolemne conuocation, ſumptuous preparation, and chargable peregrination: and before the end, long, coſtly, and tedious abode, yet neyther do or can the Fathers of the councels determin any thinge there, which the Pope hath not before concluded, ſitting at home. This may ſeeme ſtrange vnto thee (gentle Reader) as ſomtimes it did my ſelfe: but I ſhall (God willing) vnfold the obſcuritie with ſuch euident perſpicuitie, as neuer man henceforth ſhall doubt therof. This ſhalbe performed, if I proue 4. things: Firſt, that the decrees of councels be of no force with Papiſts, vnleſſe the Popes Legates agree vnto the decrees of Councels, yet are the ſaid decrees of no force: If the Legates ſhall conſent to any one jot contrarie to the Popes appointment. Thirdlie, If I proue that the Pope cannot delegate his authority vnto the legats whom he ſendeth to the councell. Fourthly, that he will not come to the councels himſelfe, but determine euery thing at home in his chãber. The proſe hereof ſhall be the flat teſtimonie of *Melchior Canus*, a moſt profound Schoolman in reaſoning, a moſt reuerend B. in dignitie, a moſt ſound Papiſt in opinion, and ſomtime the chiefeſt & moſt excellent profeſſour of diuinitie, in *Salmanca*. This *Canus* writeth on this manner:

Si Legatus contra inſtructionem agit, non cenſetur ex poteſtate delegata agere, atq; adeo non eſt, cur eo modo acta ſuperioris auctoritate probata eſſe credantur. Et paulò pòſt: Decreta igitur quæ à Legato contra ſedis Apoſtolica traditionem approbantur, non habent Romanæ Eccleſiæ authoritatem, nec aliter ſe habent, quam ſià Concilio ſine Legatis prodiſſent. & paulo pòſt. Solidam auctoritatem, quam in confirmandis & fratribus & dogmatibus Petrus habet, in Legatos transferre non poteſt. *Canus lib. 5. de auctor. con. c. 5*

If the Legat do any thing contrary to inſtruction giuen him, he muſt not be deemed to proceed of power delegate, & ſo there is no cauſe why the P. ſhalbe thoght to aproue the decrees. The decrees therfor, which the Legat ſhal aproue againſt tradition of the church of Rome, haue no autority from the church of Rome, neither are they of more force, than if they had proceeded from the Councell without conſent of the Legats: the ſound authority therfore which Peter hath, in cõfirming his brethren & decrees, he canot transfer to his Legats. Theſe are the expreſſe wordes of *Canus*, that great piler of popery. From whom

To what end are councels, when euery thing muſt be as the Pope ſaith at home

I note firſt, that decrees of Councels be of no force without conſent of the Legates. I note ſecondly, that the decrees of councels, euen when they haue the conſent of the Legats: are yet of no force when the Legates condiſcend to any thing, againſt the Popes mind. I note thirdly, that the Pope cannot tranſlate or giue his authority vnto the Legate, and conſequently, the Pope greatly abuſeth the whol world, and yet will allow nothing that they do: vnleſſe it be the ſame that he decreeth in his chaire at home. Now that he neuer commeth to coūcels in his owne perſon, Bellarminus recordeth in this manner:

Bellarm. lib. 1. de concil. ca. 19

Summus Pontifex nunquam interfuit Concilijs Orientalibus per ſe, &c.

The Pope was neuer preſent at the Councels in the Eaſt church, in his owne perſon: and why was not the Pope preſent at general councels in the Eaſt church? *Bellarminus* giueth two reaſons; the one forſooth, becauſe it was not conuenient, that the head ſhould follow the members. The other, becauſe the Emperor would euer ſit in the higheſt place: which our humble Father the Pope could not endure. Out of whoſe words I note two things: the one, that the higheſt Place in councels, was in olde time reſerued to the Emperour: the other, that the Greeke Church did neuer acknowledge the Popes primacie.

Marke what the Popes vaſſall ſaith.

The ſecond Concluſion.

IN theſe latter daies ſince the Pope attained the vſurped Iuriſdiction, general councels are ſo deſtitute of the holy ghoſts aſiſtance (thogh the Papiſts neuer ceaſe to bragge thereof) that they decree altogither againſt the holie Ghoſt. This is manifeſt by the ſolemne decrees of the late Councell of Trent, as after due examination wil euidently appeare. Firſt therefore, the ſaide councell decreed flatly, that to be no matrimonie which was approued Matrimonie by the vniforme conſent of the auncient catholike church, and which is this daye perfect Matrimonie by Chriſts inſtitution. Theſe be the verie wordes of the Councell:

Conc. Triden. de reformat. Seſ. 8. p. 469.

Qui aliter quam præſente parocho vel alio Sacerdote de ipſius ſeu ordinarij licentia, & duobus vel tribus teſtibus matrimonium contrahere attentabunt, eos ſancta ſynodus ad ſic contrahendum omnino inhabiles reddit, & huiuſmodi contractus irritos & nullos eſſe decernit preſenti decreto.

They that ſhall go about to marry otherwiſe, then in the preſence of the pariſh prieſt, or of ſome other prieſt, by his licence, or graunt of the Ordinarie, and with two or three witneſſes, thoſe the holy councell maketh vtterly vncapable of Marriage, and defineth by this preſent decree, ſuch contracts to be fruſtrate. By which wordes, and by

which decree we see plainly, that this day those persons are made vncapeable of Matrimonie, and their marriage disanulled, whom christ pronounceth capeable, and whose marriage he approued. For before this decree of the late councell of Trent, all Papists in the worlde approued priuate and secret matrimonies, for true and perfect: yea, all learned papists do confesse constantlie, such clandestine Matrimonies to bee true marriages in England, albeit that such contracts be of no force neither in Spaine nor Italie, by their religion. The reason hereof is, becawse promulgation of the said Tridentine councels decree was not yet made in England, as appeareth by the first cannon in the viii. section, *de reformatione*. This constant opinion of al Diuines, the councell it selfe acknowledged in these words:

Behold here the magnificence of popish coūcels.

Dubitandum non est, clandestina matrimonia libero consensu facta rata & vera esse matrimonia, quandiu Ecclesia ea irrita non fecit. *Conc. Triden. Sess. 8. de reformatione.*

There is no doubt, but clandestine and secret matrimonies made with free consent, were perfect and true Matrimonies, so long as the church did not disanull the same. Yea, the councell of Trent acknowledgeth matrimony to be one of the 7. Sacraments of the new Testa. instituted by Christ, and yet accurseth all such as beleeu not ꝑ church of Rome to haue authority to dissolue the same. In these words:

Si quis dixerit matrimonium non esse verè & propriè, vnum ex septem legis Evangelicæ sacramentis à Christo domino institutum. sed ab hominibus in ecclesiam invectum, neq; gratiam conferre, anathema sit. *Conc. Trident. sess. 8. Can. 1 de matrimon.*

If any shall say that Matrimony is not truly and properlie one of the seven Sacraments of the Euangelicall law instituted by Christ our L. but brought into the church by men, neither to giue grace, accursed be that man. And in another place he hath these words;

Si quis dixerit Ecclesiam non potuisse constituere impedimenta matrimonium dirimentia. vel in ijs constituendis errasse, anathema sit. *Sess. 8. can. 4.*

If any shall say, that the Church coulde not appoint impedimentes which dissolue matrimonie, or that the Churche erred in appointinge them, accursed be that man. These be the decrees of the holy counsell of Trent, which, as the Papists beleeue, had the assistance of the Holy-Ghost, and therfore could not erre. Out of which decrees we haue first, that matrimony is a contract instituted by Christ himselfe: we haue secondly, that it is an holy sacrament with the papists: we haue thirdly, that it is now no Sacrament with the Papists, which by Christs institution is a Sacrament in their religion: we haue fourthly, that matri-

monial contracts, made without the presence of a Priest: are true and perfect matrimonies, by Christes law and institution: we haue Fiftly, that such matrimonies, to wit, clandestine, are disanulled and made no matrimonies, by the Pope and his Tridentiue Counsell, neither will it help to say, as the wiser sort of Papists doth, that the Counsell doth not vnmary persons already married, but onely disableth vnmarried persons so, as their prohibited marriages cannot be of force. For first, the Councell pronounceth that to be no Mariage, by reason of mans prohibition, which without such prohibition should be perfect mariage by Christs institution: as is already proued out of the saide Counsell. Secondly, that prohibition taketh away the liberty of the Gospell, as which implieth a negatiue precept not contained in the law of nature: for as their famous popish doctor *Franciscus à Victoria* writeth,

Victor. relect. 7 de matrimon. pag. 280

Lex Euangelica lex libertatis à Christo & Apostolis vocatur, quod solo iure naturali post Euangelium Christiani teneantur, ex omnibus quæ in veteri lege erant.

The law of the Gospell is termed the law of liberty, by Christ and his Apostles: because after the Gospell Christians are bound onely to the law of nature, cõcerning al such things as wer in the old law. thirdly, because this to do, is to chalenge greater authority than Christ hath, and to be aboue Christ. The reason whereof is euident, because an inferior cannot change the law of his superior, vnlesse he haue from his superiour commission so to do: which *Victoria* well obserued in these wordes:

Victor. de potest papæ & con. rel 4. ad. S. p. 133

Dispensatio in lege spectat solum ad legislatorem, vel superiorem, vel ad illum cui specialiter commiserint ipsi.

Dispensation in the Law appertaineth onely to the lawmaker, or to his superiour, or to whom they especially graunt commission: If aunswere be made, that the Pope hath such commission: then would I know, whether he receiued it by word or writing: in the mean season the saide *Victoria* telleth the Pope, that he cannot dispence in the lawe diuine. These be his words:

Victor. vbi supra.

Manet ergo conclusio tanquam certa & firma, quod in primo genere præceptorum Concilij, scilicet quæ sunt iuris diuini, Papa non potest dispensare.

The conclusion therfore abideth firm and sure, that in the 1. kind of preceptes of the Counsell: to witte, which are of the lawe diuine, the pope cannot dispence. And of *Victora* his opinion, are *Thomas Aquinas, Anthoninus, Syluester, Soto, Couarruuias*, and all learned Papists.

Fourthly

Fourthly, becauſe that which is of more force, to wit, a ſimple vowe, doth not diſſolue matrimony: for if that which is of greater force cannot diſanull matrimony, much leſſe that, which is of ſmaller force, as both the rule of Logick and experience teacheth. Now, that a ſimple vow is of greater force than the Popes prohibition, cannot be denied: for it is *de iure diuino*, as all the Papiſts confeſſe, and as the Scripture recordeth. And that a ſimple vow doth not diſſolue matrimony, *Angelus* proueth at large, out of the popiſh canon law. Fiftly, becauſe the P. or Councel cannot change the eſſence or eſſentiall parts of matrimony, for ſo ſaith the *Tridentine* Counſell. And if it were otherwiſe, the Pope might make more or fewer ſacraments at his pleaſure: whereupon it followeth neceſſarilie, that all matrimoniall contracts be as perfectlie matrimonies this day, as they were in Chriſtes time: notwithſtanding the prohibition of the Pope, or of his councel. For the eſſece and ſubſtantiall partes abiding unaltred and perfect, the matrimonie muſt needs be perfect. Sixtly, becauſe the Prieſt is meere extrinſecal vnto the contract, and therefore cannot neceſſarily concur to the eſſentiall conſtitution thereof. The councell then in this decree, was deſtitute of the holy Ghoſt. The ſaide Counſell affirmeth the ſolemne vow of religion, to diſſolue matrimony in theſe words:

Pſal. 75. Eccleſ. 5. *Angelus de Matrimon. imped* 5

Si quis dixerit matrimonium ratum non conſummatum, per ſolemnem religionis profeſſionem alterius coniugum non dirimi, anathema ſit.

Conc. Triden. de mat. Seſ. 8. can. 6.

If any ſhall ſay that Matrimony firme not conſummate, is not diſſolued by ſolemne profeſſion of religion of the one party, accurſed be that man. This decree likewiſe is flat againſt the holy Ghoſt: which to be ſo, I prooue by ſundry meanes. The Councel it ſelfe ſhal firſte confute it ſelfe, when it ſayth thus:

Conc. Trident. ſeſſ. 8. in init.

Matrimonij perpetuum indiſſolubilemq; nexum, primus humani generis parens diuini ſpiritus inſtinctu pronunciavit, tum dixit: hoc nunc os ex oſſib. meis, & caro de carne mea: & paulo poſt: quod deus coniunxit, homo non ſeparet.

The firſt parent of mankind pronounced by the inſtinct of the holy Ghoſt, the perpetuall and indiſſoluble bond of matrimony, when he ſaid: this is now bone of my bones, and fleſh of my fleſh: and a litle after: what therfor god hath coupled togither, let no mā put aſunder: theſe are the words of the Counſell: by which we ſee euidentlie confeſſed, euen of the counſel: ỹ matrimony was indiſſoluble by gods appointment, before the conſumation (as they terme it,) or before copulation carnal, which is al one. Wherupon I infer firſt, that matrimonie before conſumation, or carnall copulation: is indiſſoluble by the

The councel, that diſſolueth, which it confeſſeth to be indiſſoluble.

holy Ghosts appointment. I infer secondly, that the councel of Trent dissolueth matrimony before consummation. I infer thirdly, directly vpon the first and second illation: that the decrees of the Councel are flatly against the Holy-ghost. I infer fourthly, that that may truly be verified of the Pope and his councell of Trent, which their own Doctor *Victoria* soundeth out against them, in these words:

Victor. relect. 4 de potest papa & con. ad 5. ar pag. 32.

Officium Apostolorum Paulus semper vocat ministerium, & certè si quis mandata Christi relaxerat, non se haberet sicut Dei minister, sed sicut aequalis, aut potius superior.

Paule tearmeth the office of the Apostles alwaies ministerye: and doubtlesse, if any should dissolue Christs commandements, he should not behaue himselfe as the minister of God, but as his equall, or rather as his superiour.

The 3. Conclusion.

ALthough the Popes of later yeares take vpon them to like or dislike, to proue or disproue the decrees of general councels at their pleasures: yet is euery generall Councell aboue the Pope, yet may euerie generall councell excommunicate, iudge, and depose the Pope, yet may euerie generall Councel set downe lawes and decrees cõcerning faith and manners: which no Pope hath authoritie once to alter or change. All which shall be proued, Gods holye spirit assisting me, by the flat testimonies and opinions of the best learned Papists. *Victoria* writeth in this maner:

Victor. vbi supra. con. 2. p 33

Si Concilium declarat aliquid esse de fide, aut de iure diuino, Papa in hoc nihil potest aliter declarare aut immutare, maximè si tale ius spectet ad finem vel ad mores Ecclesiæ vniuersalis.

If the Councel declare any thing to be of faith or of the law diuine, in this point the Pope can no otherwise declare or change: especially, if such law appertain either to faith or mãers of the vniuersal Church. Of this opinion are many other learned Papists, and especially, their Angelicall Doctor Thomas *Aquinas:* that euery generall Counsell is aboue the pope: great learned papists affirme constantly, to wit, *Abulensis, Panormitanus, Ioannes Gerson, Almainus, Cardinalis Cameracensis,* and *Cardinalis Florentinus. Panormitanus* argueth out of Pope *Gregories* wordes, that as the Pope cannot change any thing in the contents of the Gospell, so neither can hee chaunge any thinge in the decrees of Counsels. Yea *Ioannes Gerson* procedeth further, and saith, that a generall Counsell cannot onely limmit the Popes power, so as he can neither

Panorm. in con Basil. num. 18. apud vict. pag 139

ther dispense nor abrogate the decree of the Councell: but also that the Councell may vpon a reasonable cause, exempt any man from his iurisdiction. That the councell may iudge and depose the Pope, as also compell him to appeare, and for his disobedience excommunicate his Holinesse: The Popes owne deare Fryer *Iosephus Angles Valentinus* auoucheth in these words: *Io. Gerson 8 part tract. 3 apud Victor. pag. 138*

Concilium Ecclesiæ potest Papam per excommunicationem compellere, vt redditurus rationem hæresis aut apostasiæ criminis cuius accusatur, compareat, & in his duobus casibus papam deponere, erit tunc illo superior, & ex consequenti antequam deponatur, per excommunicationem illum vt in iudicio compareat, compellere: aliter enim si non posset Concilium Papam compellere, neq; posset illum iudicare. *Iosephus in 4 sent. p. 2. q. de excom. art. 4 dif. 1. conclu. 3*

A generall Councell may by excommunication compel the Pope to appeare, and to giue an account of that heresie or apostasie, whereof he is accused: and in these two cases excommunicate him. The thing is euident, bicause when it can in these two cases depose the Pope, it shal then be his superior, and consequently, before he be deposed cõpell him by excommunication to appeare in iudgment. For otherwise, if the Councell could not compel the pope, neither could it iudg him. I could alledge many like testimonies in this behalfe, but it is needles: bicause many expresse texts in the Popes own canon law, do witnesse the same: whereof this one of Pope *Zozimus* may suffice for many,

Contra statuta sanctorum patrum condere aliquid aut immutare, nec huius quidem sedis potest authoritas. *25 q 1. cap. contra*

To make any law, or to change any thing against the decrees of the holy fathers: this our seate of Rome hath no authority.

Victoria saith thus:

Bene scio quod Panormitanus, & Gerson, & Okam defendunt, quod licet appellare a papa ad Concilium. *Victor. relect. 4 de potest papa con. 23. p. 149*

I know right well, that *Panormitain*, *Gerson* and *Okam* do hold, that we may appeale from the Pope vnto a generall Councell.

Bellarminus granteth, that albeit *Cameracensis*, *Gerson*, *Almain*, *Cusanus*, *Panormitanus*, *Florentinus*, *Abulensis*, (who all are great Popish doctours) doe differ in the manner, yet doe they all acknowledge the power of a generall counsell, to be farre greater than the authoritie of the Pope.

These be his very owne words:

Conueniunt tamen in eo omnes, vt doceant esse hanc potestatem immediatè

Bellarm. de con. lib. 2. 1. 14

in ecclesia, & proinde mortuo papa vel deposito vel nolente adesse concilio, concilium non propterea esse corpus imperfectum, sed perfectũ & habere potestatẽ papalẽ definiendi de fide, sanciendi leges, dandi indulgentias &c. exquib. deducunt concilium esse supra papam, & posse ipsum iudicare, & punire: & idem esse quærere, an papa sit maior concilio, ac si quæreretur, an pars sit maior suo toto.

But they all agree in this, that they teach this power to be immediatly in the church: and therefore when the Pope is dead, or deposed or wil not come to the counsel (as he neuer doth,) that then the counsell is not an verperfect body, but perfect, and hath papall power to define matters of faith, to make lawes, to giue pardons, &c. Wherevpon they gather that the counsell is aboue the Pope, that it can iudg him and punish him, and that it is all one to demand if the P. be greater then the counsell, as if it were asked if the part be bigger then the whole. The counsell of Basill defined it for an article of our faithe, to beleeue that the Counsell is aboue the Pope.

These be the expresse words of the Counsell:

Conc. Basilen. sess. 33

Veritas de potestate concilij generalis vniuersalem ecclesiam representantis supra papam & quemlibet alterum, declarata per Constantiense & hoc Basileense generalia concilia, est veritas fidei catholicæ.

The verity of the power of a generall counsell representing the vniuersall Church aboue the Pope, and euery other person declared by the generall counsell of Constance, and this of Basill, is the very truth of the catholike faith. And the counsell addeth another clause, to wit, that whosoeuer denieth this veritie obstinately, is to be reputed for an hereticke. In fine, Pope *Vrbanus* saith thus:

25. q. 1. cap sunt quidam

Vbi apertè Dominus vel eius apostoli, et eos sequẽtes sancti patres sententialiter aliquid definierunt, ibi non novam legem Rom. Pontifex dare, sed potius quod prædicatum est, vsque ad animam & sanguinem confirmare debet.

Where our Lord or his apostles haue spoken any thing plainly, and the holy fathers comming after them, haue defined any thing iudicially, there the Bishoppe of Rome must not make anye newe lawe, but rather confirme, that which is preached, with the best bloude in his body.

The fourth Conclusion.

GEnerall and Popish counsels in these daies, are as a nose of waxe, and the decrees thereof as vncertaine as the wind.

This conclusion is proued to be such, by the expresse iudgement of great learned Papistes.

Bel-

Bellarminus writeth of counsels, in this manner: *Bellar. de con li. 1. cap. 18*

Nos dicimus, concessum episcoporum in concilijs legitimis esse verum iudicium concessum, et eorum decreta et leges necessario sequendas.

we say, that the assembly of Bishops in lawfull counsels, is the true assembly of iudges, and that their decrees and lawes must be followed of necessity.

But in another place, the same *Bellarminus* hath these words:

Dico igitur, concilium illud non posse errare, quod absolutè est generale, et ecclesiam vniversam perfectè representat: eiusmodi autem concilium non est, antequam adsit sententia summi pontificis. *bellar. lib. 2 de conc. cap 11*

I say therfore that the counsell cannot erre, which is absolutely generall, and which representeth the vniuersal church perfectly: but such a counsell is not before the Pope giue his assent. And he saith againe in the selfe same Chapter:

Idem enim est sive pontifex expresse concilium reprobet, sive concilium agat contra pontificis sententiam.

For it is all one, whether the Pope expressely disalow the counsell, or the counsel do against the Popes mind. Now in the first place *Bellarminus* telleth vs, that the bishops are true iudges in the councels, and haue definitiue voices in the same: and that their decrees must needes be followed. But in the other two places he singeth another song, and telleth vs, that though the Pope commeth not in person to the counsels, but sendeth his legates in his place: yet are the decrees of suche counsels of no force, nor to any purpose, vnlesse they be according to the Popes mind. They are therefore as a nose of waxe, because when the bishops haue imployed their whole industry, when they haue vsed long consultation, when they haue disputed the matter, *pro et contra:* when they haue inuocated the Holy ghost, and haue with mature deliberation sette downe cannons, accursing such as will not obaye the same: the Pope notwithstandinge saithe, all this is not worth a straw, as which is contrary to his opinion, that cannot erre, and so of none effect. Flat contradiction in the Iesuite.

For the vncertainty of the decrees of counsels. *Bellarm.* saith thus:

Non potest fieri vt aliquando ad finem controuersiarum deueniatur, nisi detur locus maiori parti suffragiorum. *bellar de conc. lib. 1. cap. 21*

It cannot be, that euer an end of controuersies should be made, vnlesse the greater parte of voyces bee of force: and he saith in another place.

Idem Bellarm. li.2.cap.11

Est autem verum decretum concilij quod fit a maiori parte, alioqui nullum esset legitum concilij decretum, cum semper aliqui dissentiant.

For it is the true decree of the counsell, which hath the consent of the greater part: otherwise there should be no lawfull decree made, because euer some dissent.

But *Melchior Canus* telleth vs another tale, and saithe in this manner.

Canus lib.5.de auct conc.cap 5.pa.164

Non itaq; quod in Romanis concessionibus fit, plurium apud nos sententia praualet: & paulo post, nõ enim numero hæc indicantur, sed pondere. Pondus autem concilijs dat summi pontificis, & grauitas, & auctoritas: quæ si adsit centum patres satis, sunt, sin desit nulli sunt satis, sunt quamlibet plurimi.

Of the popes grauitie and authority, see at large in the 3. chapter

Not therefore as in humaine consents the voices of mo are of force with vs: for these thinges are not iudged in number, but in weight: and the counsels receiue their weighte from the grauitie and authoritie of the Pope: which if it be once present an hundreth Fathers are enoughe, but if it wante, none are enough, bee as manye as they will.

Now sir, *Bellarminus* telleth vs, that moe voices in counselles muste needs be of force: but *Canus* saith, it is not so: for bee they many, be they few, what part the Pope liketh shall be true.

The decrees therefore of Popish counselles, are as vncertaine as the wind. For after the fathers of the counsels haue fasted longe, prayed much, consulted grauely, deliberated naturally, decreed soberly, commaunded strictly, and accursed seuerely: neither others not yet themselues can tell, what shall be of force therein: for all must be as pleaseth the Popes holinesse, and perhaps their decrees will not contente his minde.

The 5. Conclusion.

NO bishops can in these our daies haue voices in counsels, but such as first sweare obedience to the Pope, and promise to defend his canon law: which thing, though most absurd, is for all that so cleare, as *Bellarminus* cannot denie the same.

These be his words:

Bellarm.lib.1. de concil.cap. vltimo.

Istud iuramentum non tollit episcoporũ libertatem, quæ in concilijs necessaria est, iurant enim se fore obedientes summo pontifici, quod intelligitur donec pontifex est, & dum iubet eaquæ secundum deum & sacros canones iubere potest, sed non iurant se non aicturos quod sentiunt in concilio, vel se non dopostituros eum si hereticum esse convincant.

This

This oth taketh not away the libertie of Bishops, which in counsels is necessarie. For they swear that they wil be obedient vnto the pope, which is to be vnderstoode, so long as he is Pope, and while he commaundeth those things, which he may commaund agreeable to God, and to the holy canons: but they sweare not, that they will not speak what they thinke in the Counsell, or that they will not depose him if they proue him to be an heretique.

Thus saith *Bellarminus*, whose onely testimony is most sufficient in all Popish affaires, as who is the Popes sworne and tenderly beloued vassall: out of whose words for more perspicuity, I note.

A point worthy the obseruation

First, that all Clergie men admited to giue voices in counselles, are sworne wholy to obey all the Popes constitutions.

I note secondly, that the saide persons are sworne to beleeue, that the Pope cannot erre in his iudiciall decrees of faith or maners: that no counselles are of force, without the Popes confirmation: that all counsels confirmed by him, are approued by the Holy-ghost: that he can excommunicate and depose all Emperous, kings, Queens, and bishops in the christian world, that hee can deliuer by his pardons all soules out of purgatorie, and a thousand like things. For all such matters are contained in his canons, and consequentlye in their most lamentable oth.

I note thirdly, that they are sworn to admit his decrees, who as they beleeue, may be an heretique.

I note Fourthly, that they are sworne to admit his iudgement in all matters of faith, whom yet they may iudge and depose for heresie.

I note fiftly, that their fundamentall article, in appointing the pope iudge ouer all controuersies: is quite ouerthrown and turned vpside down, in this *Bellarminus* his explication. For when he saith, (while he commaundeth, &c.) he graunteth euery Bishop freedome to examin and iudge, when the Pope commaundeth things agreeable to Godde and the Canons. Which libertie, if they would constantly performe: al true Christians and perfect Catholickes, woulde agree with them. For none that beleeue rightly in God, will deny obedience to the P. when he preacheth and teacheth any thing agreeable to God and holy Canons. But true Christians finding his Canons to be disholy, and his decrees to be against God: thinke as *Bellarminus* heere teacheth them, that they are not bound to obey him. For as another great lerned papist *Franciscus à Victoria* saith profoundly, the vniuste lawes of

The inconstancy of Popish doctrin, is the cause of dissenting from them

the pope do not bind in conſcience.

Theſe are his words:

Ego pro certo habeo, quod omnes leges iniuſtæ etiam Papæ, non obligant in foro conſcientiæ.

Victor. relect. 4 de poteſt papæ & con. propoſ. 27. p. 157

I hold it for a conſtant and vndoubted truth (ſaith the Popes learned Doctor) that all vniuſt lawes euen of the Pope, do not bind in the court of conſcience.

The Papiſts then, who charge us ſo ſtrictly to obey the popes lawes, and withall prohibite vs to examine the ſame, doe denie vs that libertie which they take vnto themſelues: and that the Reader may fullie vnderſtand the abhomination of the othe, which all Popiſh biſhops ſweare vnto the Pope: I will here ſet downe the expreſſe words thereof, as I find them in their own decretals:

Ego N. Epiſcopus, ab hac hora fidelis ero S. Petro, ſanctæq; Romanæ eccleſiæ, dominoq; meo Papæ N. eiuſq; ſucceſſoribus Canonicè intrantibus. Sequitur. Papatum Romanæ Eccleſiæ, & regulas ſanctorum patrum, adiutor ero, ad defendendum & retinendum contra omnes homines; ſic me Deus adiuvet, et hæc ſancta Evangelia.

Decret. lib. 2 tit. 24. cap. 4

I (Iohn Fiſher) Biſhop, will be faithfull from henceforth to S. Peter, and to the holy Church of Rome, and to my L. (Boniface the P. and to his ſucceſſors choſen Canonically: and I will be an helper to defend (againſt all the world) the Popedome, or Papall ſuperioritie, and the rules of the holy fathers, ſo God me helpe, and the holy goſpell. Loe here gentle Reader, open rebellion is required and by evangelicall othe confirmed, of ſubiects againſt their Soueraignes: for the biſhops of euery contrey, are ſubiects to kings of the ſame countrey, and yet they ſweare to defend the Popes tyrannie, and vſurped iuriſdiction, againſt their naturall dread Soueraignes. For they ſwear to defend the Popes vſurped authoritie againſt all people none excepted: which his vſurped authority (as you haue partly heard, and ſhall heare more at large in the ſixt chapter following) extendeth it ſelfe to the tranſlation of kingdoms, Empires, and regalities.

THE COROLLARIE.

FIrſt therefore, ſince generall counſels in theſe dayes, are nothinge elſe, but a meere ſubtilty to deceiue Gods people withall.

Secondly, ſince the ſaid councels decree altogither againſte the holy Ghoſt.

Third-

Thirdlye, since Popes take vpon them, to approue or disproue councels at their pleasures.

Fourthly, since by popish doctrine, Councels can iudge and depose Popes.

Fiftly, since Councels be as a nose of wax, and as vncertain as the weathercocke.

Sixtly, since appeales may be made vnto councels from the pope, though the pope deny the same.

Seuenthly, since the Popes doctrine cannot be maintained, but by extorted othes.

I conclude, that it is a sufficient Motiue for me to renounce the Romish Religion, as false, erroneous and pernitious doctrine.

Thus much of the third Motiue.

The fifth Chapter.

Of the Popes dispensations.

THe enormities in popish dispensations are such, so great, and so many: that if I should recite all, time would sooner faile me then matter whereof to speake. I will therefore at this present content my selfe with some few, reseruiug the residue till more conuenient time.

The 1. Conclusion.

THe Pope vsually dispenseth with professed Monkes, that they may marry lawfully: which dispensation is not onely against the lawe diuine with them, but flatly against the Popes owne religion.

In this conclusion, three things are to be proued.

First, that the Pope doth dispense, as is said.

Secondly, that his dispensation is against the law diuine.

Thirdly, that it is against his owne religion.

For the first part, Nauarrus writeth in this maner:

Papa potest dispensare cum monacho iam professo, vt contrahit matrimonium: imo de facto multi papæ dispensarunt. Consentit ipse Caietanus, Antoninus, & Palvdanus. Nauarrus de Iudiciis, notab. 3. pag. 275

The pope may dispense with a monke alreadye professed, that hee may take a wife and marry: for manye Popes *de facto* haue dispensed so. Caietanus, Antoninus, and Palludanus are of the same opinion. For the seconde point Victoria writeth thus: *Multi tenent quod*

Papa

vict. de potest. papa relect. 4 ad 3. argum. *Papa non potest dispensare in votis, quia dispensatio proprie est relaxatio iuris. vnde cum sit de iure diuino, dispensatio erit iuris diuini relaxatio, quod sane ad papam non spectat. & vtinam hæc opinio non sit vera.*

Many hold, that the Pope cannot properly dispense in vowes, because dispensation properly is the relaxation of the Law. Wherevpon since a vow is of the Law diuine, dispensation must be remission of the law diuine: which thing doubtlesse belongeth not vnto the pope: and would to God this opinion were not true.

Loe, this religious Fryer is so zealously affected towards the Popes credit, that he wisheth the opinion which ouerthroweth his practise were not true.

And the Popes famous Canonist *Couarruuias*, writeth to the same effect in these words:

Couar. to. 1. c. 20. par. 11. in med. ipsius col. prima. *Nec me latet D. Thomam previa maxima deliberatione asserere, Rom. Pontificem non posse propria dispensatione continentiæ solemne Monachorum votum tollere. & paulo post: oportet tamen primam opinionem defendere, ne quæ passim fiant evertantur omnino.*

Neither am I ignorant, that Saint Thomas affirmeth after great deliberation, that the Bishoppe of Rome cannot with his dispentation, take away from Monkes their solemn vow of chastity: This notwithstanding we must defend the first opinion, least those thinges which are practised euery where, be vtterly ouerthrown: thus saith the great canonist and reuerend Popish Bishop *Couarruuias*, out of whose words sundry things may be noted worthy the obseruation.

Necessity hath no law, the popes mind must be obeyed.

First, that the papists cannot agree about the popes authority.

Secondly, that great learned Papists among whom *Thom.* Aquinas is one, (whose doctrine sundry Popes haue confirmed,) do denie the Popes authority in the premisses.

The pops doings must be defended, because otherwise poperie cannot stand

Thirdly, that the contrary opinion must be defended, for the honesty and safegard of the popes religion.

Fourthly, that most miserable is the Popes doctrine, which needeth such poore and beggarly shifts for the maintenance thereof.

Fiftly, that the papists haue no cause so to exclaime against priestes mariage, since the Pope dispenseth with his monkes to marry at their pleasures. For the mariage of priests is onely prohibited by the Popes law, but the marriage of monkes by the law diuine, as the popes own deare doctors Victoria and Aquinas tell vs.

Sixtly, that *Aquinas* his doctrine, which the Pope hath aproued, con-

confuteth the Popes religion. For the thirde point, *Thomas Aquinas* giueth this testimonie, out of the Popes owne law.

Abdicatio proprietatis sicut etiam custodia castitatis, adeo annexa est regulæ monachali, vt contra eam nec summus Pontifex possit indulgere.

The renouncing of propertie, as also the keeping of Chastitie, is so annexed to the rule of Monkes, that the Pope himselfe cannot dispence against the same: This saying of *Thomas Aquinas*, is found verbatim in the Popes canons, *Extra de statu monarchorum cum ad monasterium.* *Extra de statu monachorum cum ad mon.*

The 2. Conclusion.

THe Pope often pronounceth matrimony dissolued by his dispensations, which is firme and stable by Christes own institution. The first part is prooued by *Martinus Nauarrus*, in these words. *Nauar. in enchir. cap. 22 par. 21*

Deuiditur (matrimonium) ante consumationem, per dispensationem Papæ iusta de causa factam.

Matrimony is dissolued before consumation, by the Popes dispensation vpon iust cause granted. And a little after he hath these words:

Quorum opinio adeo obseruatur, quod etiam ter vel quater ad petitiones consilio meo antequam in vrbem venissem oblatas, Paulus 3. et Pius 4. per suas dispensationes dissoluerunt quasdam matrimonia omnino clandestina nondum cõsummata, in remedium animarum alioquin probabiliter periturarum.

whose opinion (he speaketh of the Canonistes who generally are of his owne opinion,) is so obserued, that thrise or foure times bee fore my comming to Rome upon petitions made by my aduise, Pope *Paulus* the third and Pope *Pius* the fourth, with their dispensations dissolued certen secret matrimonies not yet consummate, for the safegard of soules which by likelihood would otherwise haue perished. And *Couarruuias* affirmeth *Paulus* the fourth and *Iulius* the thirde, to haue dispensed in like maner: these be his words: Lo how readily the pope displeaseth God, for the pleasure of man

Nec me latet Paulum quartum summum ecclesiæ Pontificem, An. 1558 hac vsum fuisse dispensatione quibusdam ex causis, quas iustissimas esse idem summus Ecclesiæ præsul existimauit. idem paulo ante Iulius 3. fecerat in eodem matrimonio, cum ecclesiæ vniuersali præsideret. *Couarruuias tom 1. cap. 7 par. 4. n. 13 col 1*

Neither am I Ignorant that Pope *Paulus* the 4. but this dispensation in practise, for certaine causes which the Pope thought to be most iust. *Iulius* the thirde when hee was Pope, graunted in like cause the same dispensation.

The second part is prooued, by the vniforme consent of al diuines. For *Bellarminus* saith;

bellar.lib.1.c.5.de matrim. prope finem.

Non autem essentialia matrimonij (ecclesia) vllo modo mutat, aut mutare potest.

But the essentiall partes of Matrimonie, the Church neither doeth change, neither can change.

And doubtles if the Church can not doe it, *á fortiori*, the Pope can not doe it, which Bellarmine will not denie, and Victoria doeth witnesse no lesse in these words.

Victo.relect.4 de potest papa & conc.p.128 ad primum.

Communis scholo theologorum negat maiorem, scilicet quod Papa possit dispensare, sed in contrarium sunt multi doctores Cannonistarum.

The common schoole of Deuines denieth the maior, to wit, that the Pope can dispense with matrimonie, but many Cannonists holde the contrarie.

Covarruv.to.1.par.2.cap7.par.4.n.14 in medio.

Covarruvias likewise saieth thus:

Tutior ac verior est communis theologorum opinio, quæ probat matrimonium ratum nondum secutà commixtione carnis & sic non consumatum, maxime posse dissolui Rom. Pontif.. dispensatione.

The common opinion of Diuines is more safe and true, which proueth that matrimonie perfected by consent, but not consummate by carnall copulation, can not be dissolued by the Popes dispensation.

And the said Covarruvias addeth these words.

Ipse vero non auderem à communi theologorum sententia discedere.

I my selfe truely durst not forsake the common opinion of deuines.

And no maruell: for Christ himselfe putteth the matter out of all

Matth.19,7 doubt, when he sayeth.

Quod Deus coniunxit homo non seperat.

That which God hath conioyned, let no man put asunder.

And in another place he sayeth thus.

Luke.16, 18 *Omnis qui demittit vxorem suam, & alteram ducit, mœchatur.*

Euerie one that putteth away his wife, and marryeth another, committeth adulterie.

And Saint Paul vpon the same argument, hath these words:

1 Cor.7,10 *His autem qui matrimonio iuncti sunt, precipio non ego sed dominus, vxorem à viro non discedere, quod si discesserit, manere innuptam, aut viro suo reconciliari, & vir vxorem non demittat.*

Those that are married commaund not I, but the Lorde, that the wife departe not from her husband: but if she shall depart, then to abide vnmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband.

Thus saith Christ, thus saith saint Paul, that man and wife ioyned by

Christ

Christ, must abide during life together, or liue vnmaried, and not be seuered by the Popes dispensation. Neither will it helpe to say as Bellarm. doth, & others with him: that Christ only speaketh *de matrimonio consummato*, and that *matrimonium ratum*, with which the Pope dispenseth, is not *de iure diuino*: For first, if *matrimonium ratum* were not *de iure diuino*: the greatest Popish deuines would not deny the Popes dispensation therein: as who graunt him power ouer lawes humane. What an absurde answer is this?

Secondly, Christ speaketh absolutely, and maketh no mention of copulation or popish consumation, which is all one.

Thirdly, with papistes matrimonie is a deuine sacrament, and so is perfect without carnall copulation.

For as their owne Canus saieth: *Canus lib. 8 de locis Theol. c. 5 pag. 246*

Sanctus spiritus & sacramenti gratia, per coitum non datur.

The holy ghost and grace of sacrament, is not giuen by copulation.

Fourthly, it followeth heereuppon, that matrimonie is not fully perfect in the Popish Church, because copulation followeth a good while after.

Fiftly, because it is absurd to say, that it beginneth to be a sacramẽt, by carnall copulation, and was not a sacrament by the priestes action.

Sixtly, it followeth heereuppon, that the marriage betweene the blessed Virgin and S. Ioseph was not perfect matrimonie: For there doubtlesse wanted popish carnall copulation.

Seuenthly, it followeth hereupon, that there was not perfect matrimonie betweene Adam and Eue: For their matrimonie was in the state of innocencie, and before all carnall copulation.

Eightly, because if matrimonie be not *de iure diuino* before copulation: there is no cause why both parties agreeing together, may not release the bargaine, and quite dissolue the contracte. For as the lawe saith: *Quisque potest suo iuri cedere*: Euery man may yeeld vp his right: which thing al, both canonists & diuines, admit for good *in sponsalibus*. *vide Victor. de potest pape p. 128. & Soto in 4. dist. 27 pag. 48*

The 3. Conclusion.

AS the Pope pronounceth, that matrimonie dissolued by vertue of his dispensation, which remaineth true and perfect matrimonie by Christes institution: So doeth he likewise pronounce by like dispensation that to be true and perfect matrimony, which both by the law deuine, and law of nature, is no matrimonie at all. The former part of this assertiue proposition is proued in the cõclusion going next before. For probatiõ of the secõd part, I make this supposal: that the Pope

hath dispensed with brothers in the mariages of their brothers wiues, as the world right well knoweth to be true.

This supposall made, I proceed in this manner. The law of Moyses was partly iudiciall, partly ceremoniall, and partly morall. The iudiciall and ceremoniall parts were abrogate by Christes passion, as witnesseth Saint Paule in these words: *Translato sacerdotio, necesse est vt & legis translatio fiat.* Translation of priesthood being made, there must also be translation of the law: but the morall and part naturall is still in force, in so much as al Christians are this daye bound to keepe the decalogue: notwithstanding the translation of the law of Moises, euen as were the Gentiles before the said law was giuen. For the gentiles were as much bound before the law, and we now after the law: to abstaine from Idolatrie, theft, adulterie, and the reste, as were the Iewes in time of the law. For as *Victoria* hath wel obserued, the Gospell is called the law of libertie, because Christians after promulgation of the gospel, are onely bound to the law of nature: of al such things as are conteined in the old law: and all diuines are of the same opinion, as witnesseth the said *Victoria*, in these words: *Receptissimum est apud omnes theologos, & necessarium est ita tenere, ex omnibus preceptis veteris legis, sola moralia integra & firma restitisse noua lege.* It is a generall opinion approued of all deuines: and it is necessarie so to hold, that of all precepts in the olde lawe onely morrall abode firme and intire in the new lawe. Thus then is it plaine, that that part of Moyses law which is moral, or natural, abideth stil in ful strength and vertu. To which I must ad two things, for the exact & perfect probatiō of this my 3 cōclusiō.

Hebru. 7. 12.

Victor. de matrim. sect. 2 relect. 7. p. 280

1. The one, that the lawe of nature is immutable, and indispensable by the power of man: and consequently, that the pope cannot dispense therewith. The other, that all the lawes prohibited in the 18. of Leuiticus, especially that of marrying the brothers wife, are morrall and prohibited by the lawe of nature. For the former parte. Victoria writeth in this manner. *In hoc genere decretorum aut Canonum, papa nihil potest immutare dispensando, & multo minus abrogando. Conclusio est omnium theologorum absque controuersia, & potest breuiter probari, quia ius naturale est immutabile, & vt legitur in decretis, naturale ius semper permanet.*

Victo. relect. 4 de potest papa prop. 1. p. 126

In this kinde of decrees or Canons the Pope can chaunge nothing by dispensation, and much lesse by abrogation. It is the conclusion of all deuines without any controuersie, and it may be prooued briefly, because the lawe of nature is immutable, and as it is in the decreos,

the

the lawe of nature abideth alwaies. Thomas Aquinas confirmeth the same in these wordes.

Sed præcepta decalogi sunt de iure naturali ideo nec in eis nec in aliis, prout vim eorum continent, licet alicui homini dispensare. Aquin in lib 3 sen. di. 37. ar4

But the precepts of the decaloge are of the lawe of nature, & therefore no man can dispense either with thē or with others, that conteine the force thereof. And the Popes famous archbishop Antoninus telleth his holines flatly, that his fulnesse of power doth in no case extend it selfe, to the law deuine or lawe of nature. These are his words:

Quantum verò ad illa quæ sunt de iure naturali vel diuino, iurisdictio seu potestas papalis non se extendit: sic vero quod ista possit mutare, vel etiam dare eis vim obligandi: et ratio est, quia inferior non potest mutare leges superioris: deus autem est superior ad papam. Anto. de potest papa. pa. 4. tit. 22. ca. 3. par. 2.

Concerning those things which are of the lawe of nature, or lawe diuine, iurisdiction or papall power doth not extend it selfe: so to wit that the Pope can change these things, or giue power obligatiue vnto them: and the reason is, because an inferiour cannot chaunge the lawes of his superior, and God is the Popes superiour. Thus then haue I prooued euidently by the Popes owne doctours. that the Pope can not dispense with the law deuine, or with the law of nature It remaineth that I likewise prooue, the lawes prohibited in Leuiticus to be the lawes of nature: and consequently, indispensable by the power of man First therfore, it is written in the selfe same chapter after the prohibition of the said degrees, in this manner. *Nec polluamini in omnibus his, quibus contaminata sunt vniuersa gentes, quas ego eiciam ante conspectum vestrum, & quibus polluta est terra, cuius ego scelera visitabo, vt evomat habitatores suos.* Be ye not polluted in all these things with which all nations are defiled, whom I wil cast out before your sight, and with which the earth is polluted, whose iniquities I will visite, that it may vomit out the inhabitants thereof. By which words we see euidently, that the breach of these lawes was wicked and vnlawfull among the gentiles: and consequently, that the Gentiles marrying within degrees heere prohibited, transgressed the lawe of nature. For they being free from all other lawes, could not be polluted by the breach of any lawe, saue onely of the law of nature. I deem he be in very deed. Leuit. 18, 24.

Secondly, euery one knoweth, and can easily discerne by naturall discourse, that a brother to marry his owne sister, is against the law of nature: and yet doth Thomas Aquinas affirme, that there is like prohibition

hibition in affinity. His words be these:

Naturall propinquity (saith he) commeth *alio modo per carnalem copulam, quæ est etiam actus naturæ ad generationem ordinatus, & ex hac causatur affinitas, quæ quidem impedit matrimonium eisdem rationibus, quibus & consanguinitas.*

Aquinas in 4. sent. di. 4, ar. 2

Naturall propinquity commeth another way by carnall copulation, which is an act of nature ordeined to generation: and of this is caused affinity, which verely prohibiteth Matrimonie by the selfe-same reasons by which consanguinity doth.

Thirdly, because many late Popish Writers do affirme the same.

Victoria hath these words:

Aliqui, vt Archiepiscopus Florent 3. p tit. 1. cap. 4. & Palud. in 4. d. 40. Videntur tenere, quod in omnibus gradibus prohibitis in Leuitico, Papa non posset dispensare. & hoc reputat Sylvester probabilius.

victor. relict. 4 de potest. papæ pa. 129. ad. 2

Some, as the archbishop of Florence, and Paludanus seeme to hold that the Pope cannot dispence, in any the degrees prohibited in Leviticus: and this opinion *Sylvester* thinketh more probable.

Fourthly, because the common opinion of the Fathers was, that all degrees prohibited in the said Leviticus, are prohibited nowe by the law diuine. Which *Iosephus Angles* constantlie auoucheth to bee so, in these words:

Duæ sunt opiniones, prima omnium fere antiquorum, qui affirmabant omnes gradus in Levit. prohibitos, esse etiam nunc iure diuino prohibitos. Hæc fuit S. Bo. Tho. Ric. & Dur. quibus adhæsit Sylvester, affirmans Papam non posse dispensare in gradibus in Levit. prohibitis.

Ioseph. Angles in 4. S. pa. 1 q. 13. art. 3

There be two opinions:

The first was of all the old writers some few excepted, whoe affirmed that all degrees prohibited in Leuiticus, are now also prohibited by the law deuine. This was the opinion of Saint *Bonauenture*, of *Thomas*, of *Richardus*, and of *Durand*, with whom *Sylvester* took part, affirming that the Pope cannot dispense with degrees prohibited in Leuiticus.

This is true not onely by the Scriptures, but euen by the testimony of the Popes owne doctors, and by the vniforme consent of approued antiquitie.

Alens words disloyall.

Absurd therefore is Cardinall *Allens* opinion, and most disloyall are his speeches: when hee in his apologie for the seminaries, iustifieth *Iames Laborne* his opinion against the premisses.

The fourth Conclusion.

THe Popes dispensations are as general, as vngodly: his corrupte vassals daily gaping and expecting, who wil aske dispensation, for euery iote in the law. This conclusion though strange to many mens cogitations, shall be proued by the constant assertion of the best learned Popish doctor.

Thus therefore writeth *Victoria*: *vict. de potest. papæ & con. relect. 4. pag. 39.*

Videmus quotidie à Romana curia tam largas, imo omnino tam dissolutas dispensationes profectas, vt orbis ferre non possit, non solùm in scandalum paruulorum, sed maiorum.

We see daily so large, yea altogither so dissolute dispensations come from the court of Rome, that the world cannot endure it, neither is that to the scandall onely of the weake, but euen of the perfect sort.

and in an other place, the said Victoria saith thus:

Sed clamat experientia in contrarium, & videmus quod nullus quærit dispensationes, quin obtineat.

But experience exclameth to the contrary: and we see that no man seeketh for dispensations, but he attaineth the same.

And in another place he saith thus: *vbi supra pag. 149*

Ego nullam dispensationem in particulari condemno, sed video duo: primum, quod in fine anni sunt tot dispensationes facta, vt nescio an sint tot qui legem seruent. Secundo, video quod omnes qui petunt afferunt dispensationes, quos miror est habere legitimas causas, vt cum eis dispensetur in impedimentis matrimonij, & irregularitatis, & in pluralitate beneficiorum.

I condemne no dispensation in particular, but I see two things: First, that in the end of the yeare there are so many dispensations gotten, as I know not if so many keepe the law. Secondly, I see all that ask bring dispensations. whome I maruell if they all haue lawfull causes, that they may be dispensed withall, in the impediments of matrimony, and of irregularitie, and for the pluralitie of spirituall livings. Loe, for spirituall livings & matrimonie, and such like, dispensations are never denied.

and in another place the said *Victoria* hath these words: Victor. vbi in pag. 151.

Et paulatim ad hanc intemperantiam dispensationum deuentum est, & huc tandem statum, vbi nec mala nostra nec remedia pati possumus, & ideo necesse est aliam rationem excogitare ad conseruandas leges. Da mihi Clementes, Linos, Syluestros, & omnia permittam arbitrio eorum. Sed vt nihil grauius dicatur in recentiores pontifices, certe multis partibus sunt priscis illis inferiores.

By little and little we are brought to these inordinat dispensations, and to this so miserable state, where we are neither able to endure our owne griefes, nor remedies assigned for the same. And therefore must

must we perforce inuent som other way, for conseruation of the laws. Giue me *Clements, Lines, Syluesters*; and I will commit all thinges vnto their charge. But to speake nothing grieuously againste these latter Popes: they are doubtlesse inferiour to Popes of olde time by many degrees. I could alleage many other testimonies: But this *Victoria* being of great credite among the Papists, is a most sufficient witnesse in their owne proceedings.

THE COROLLARIE.

FIrst therefore, since the Pope dispenseth vsuallie with professed monkes, against his owne Canons, and religion.

Secondly, since the pope dissolueth by his dispensations, such matrimonies as are indissoluble by Christes institution.

Thirdlye, since the Pope pronounceth that to be true matrimony by vertue of his dispensation: which both by the law diuine, and law of nature, is no matrimony at all.

Fourthly, since the Pope doth not only dissolue Christs lawe, but also turneth his owne law vpside downe, by his vngratious and intollerable dispensations.

I conclude, that it is a sufficient Motiue for me to renounce the Romish Religion, as false, erroneous and pernitious doctrine.

Thus much of the third Motiue.

The [illegible] Chapter.

Of the Popes Authoritie, and Iurisdiction.

THe Papistes boast that the Pope is Christs vicar generall, that he hath fulnesse of power, that all ecclesiasticall Iurisdiction is dependant vpon him: that he can excommunicate kinges, depose kings, and giue their kingdoms vnto others: concerning which points, I will proceed by way of Conclusions.

The 1. Conclusion.

THe Ecclesiasticall power of all the Apostles, was generall ouer all the world, equall with Peters, and the selfe-same that Peters was.

Mat, cap. vlt, verse 19 Christ himselfe proueth this conclusion, when he saith: *Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo & in terra, euntes ergo docete omnes gentes.*

All power is giuen me in heauen and in earth; goe therefore and teach all Nations. In

In another place he ſaith thus:

Hoc facite in meam commemorationem.

Doe this in remembrance of me. Luke.22, 20

And againe thus: Iohn 20, 23

Quorum remiſeritis peccata, remittuntur eis.

Whoſe ſinnes ye ſhall forgiue, are forgiuen them.

And in another place thus:

Amen dico vobis, quæcunque alligaueritis ſuper terram, erunt ligata & in cœlo, & quæcunque ſolueritis ſuper terram, erunt ſoluta et in cœlo: Matth. 18, 18

Verily I ſay vnto you, what things ſoeuer ye ſhall bind vpon earth, ſhall be bound alſo in heauen: and whatſoeuer things ye ſhall looſe vpon earth, ſhall be looſed alſo in Heauen. All which ſayings Chriſt ſpoke and vttered of and to his Apoſtles al, aſwell as to Peter: making them all apoſtles, aſwell as Peter. And as they were all Apoſtles aſwel as Peter, ſo had they all equall power, not onely of order, but of Iuriſdiction alſo: which their *Victoria* recordeth in theſe words: Matt, 10, v, 1 Mark, 3, 14 Luke 6, 14 *victor de poteſt eccleſ. relict. 2 conc. 3. pa. 84.*

Ad officium Apoſtolatus, ſpectat poteſtas ordinis & iuriſdictionis.

To the office of Apoſtleſhip, pertaineth both the power of order and of Iuriſdiction. And Saint Cyprian diſcideth this matter in moſt plaine and euident words, when he ſaith thus: *Cyp. de ſimp. prælat. pa. 113*

Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum, Ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, &c. & paulo poſt: *Hoc erant vtiq; & cæteri Apoſtoli quod fuit Petrus, pari conſortio præditi & honoris & poteſtatis, ſed exordium ab vnitate proficiſcitur, vt Eccleſia vna monſtretur.*

Our Lord ſpeaketh vnto Peter, I ſay vnto thee that thou art Peter, & vpon this rocke wil I builde my church, &c. *and a little after:* the ſame were the reſt of the apoſtles doubtles, that Peter was: indued with equall fellowſhip, both of honor and power: but the begining proceedeth from vnitie, that the Church may be ſhewed to be one.

Couarruuias that famous Canoniſt, albeit he would verie gladly defend the Popes pretended power, and haue only Peters power ordinarie and independent: yet can he not deny our Sauior Chriſt to haue giuen equall power to all the apoſtles. Theſe be his very words: *Couarruu. to. 1. par. 2 cap 7. 9. pa. 242. col. 4. prope finem.*

Etenim iuxta catholicorum virorum auctoritates, & communem omnium traditionem, apoſtoli parem ab ipſo Domino Ieſu cum Petro poteſtatem ordinis & iuriſdictionis acceperunt: ita quidem, vt quilibet apoſtolorum æqualem cum Petro habuerit poteſtatem ab ipſo deo, in totum orbem, & in omnes actus quos Petrus agere poterat. For according to the authorities of catholike wri-

ters, and the common tradition of all, the Apoſtles receiued from our Lord Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe, equall power with Peter, both of power and iuriſdiction: inſomuch doubtleſſe, as euery apoſtle had equal power with Peter from God himſelfe, and that both over all the worlde, and to all actions that Peter could doe.

Out of which teſtimonies I note firſt, that al the apoſtles had equal auᵭhority with Peter. I note ſecondly, that all the apoſtles had power ouer all the world, euen as Peter had. I note thirdly, that what act ſoeuer Peter could do, euery other apoſtle could doe the ſame. I note fourthly, that the iuriſdiction of every apoſtle, did extende as far as Peters. I note fiftly, that Chriſts ſpeeches to Peter in the ſingular number, did not argue ſuperiority of iuriſdiction: but did onely ſignifie the vnity of his Church. I note ſixtly, that all this is confirmed by the opinion of Catholike writers, and by tradition of all generaly. For all theſe ſix points are expreſly conteined (if they be wel marked) in the auᵭhorities already alledged. The ſame are confirmed by the teſtimony of S. Auguſt. in ſundry places of his works.

Aug. in ſerm. Pet. et Pauli, apud Can.

Claves (inquit Auguſtinus) non vnus homo Petrus, ſed vnitas accepit eccleſiæ

Not one only man Peter receiued the keys, but the vnity of ꝑ church.

In another place, the ſame S. *Auguſtine* writeth in this maner:

Aug. in lib. de agone Chriſt. cap. 30. tom. 3

Eccleſiæ catholice perſonam ſuſtinet Petrus, & cum ei dicitur ad omnes dicitur: amas me, paſce oves meas.

Peter repreſenteth the perſon of the Catholike church, and when it is ſayd to him, it is ſaid to all: Loveſt thou me, feed my ſheepe.

So then, that text of ſcripture, which with the Papiſts is the foundation of Popiſh primacy, to wit, Feed my ſheep: maketh no more for Peters ſuperiority, then it doth for ſupremacy of other apoſtles. for as you haue heard out of S. avguſt. it was aſwell ſpoken to all, as vnto Peter. Yea, the groſſe imaginations of Papiſts, concerning the building of the Church vpon Peter, is liuely and evidently confuted of S. auguſtine in an other place, where he thus writeth:

auguſt. de verb. dom. ſer. 13, tom. 10.

Tu es inquit Petrus, et ſuper hanc Petram quam confeſſus es, ſuper hanc Petram quam cognoviſti, dicens, tu es Chriſtus filius dei vivi, ædificabo Eccleſiam meam. id eſt, ſuper meipſum filium dei vivi, ædificabo Eccleſiam meam. ſuper me ædificabo te, non me ſuper te.

Thou art Peter ſaith Chriſt, and vpon this rock which thou haſt confeſſed, vpon this rock which thou haſt acknowledged, ſaying, Thou art Chriſt the ſon of the liuing God, will I build my Churche: that is, vpon my ſelfe the ſonne of the liuing God, will I buyld my Church.

I wyll buyld thee vpon my ſelfe, bvt not my ſelfe vpon thee. Marke well theſe words (gentle Reader) with the other laſt rehearſed out of S. *Augvſt.* and doubtleſſe, if plaine and manifeſt expoſition of the ſcripture will content thy mind, thou canſt not but now haue thy deſire. The great generall councel of Conſtantinople, makes the church of Conſtantinople equall in Eccleſiaſticall iuriſdiction, with ꝑ church of Rome. Theſe be the words: *Renovantes quæ à ſ. patribus* 150. *qui in hac regia vrbe convenerunt, & à* 630. *qui Chalcedone convenerunt, conſtituta ſunt; decernimus, vt thronus Conſtantinop. æqualia privilegia cum antiquæ Romæ throno obtineat, & in Eccleſiaſticis negotijs vt illa emineat, ſecundus poſt illam exiſtens.* We renewing the canons which were ſet down by the 150. holy fathers, aſſembled in this Royall citty, and by the 630. Fathers gathered togither in *Calcedon*: doe define, that the See of Conſtantino. haue equal priuiledges with the See of old Rome, and that it excel as Rome in eccleſiaſtical affaires, being the ſecond after Rome. *Conc. Conſt. 6. can. 36*

And long before all this, that famous councell of Nice, diſtributing circuits, and aſsigning determinate iuriſdictions to the Patriarchall ſeates, appointed to the church of Rome prefixed limites, as to the reſt. Theſe be the words: *Conc. Nicen. can. 6*

Mos antiquus perduret in Egypto, vel Lybia, et Pentapoli, vt Alexandrinus Epiſcopus horum omnium habeat poteſtatem, quoniam quidem et Epiſcop. Romæ parilis mos eſt.

Let the old cuſtome continue in Egypt, or Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the biſhop of alexandria may haue power ouer them all, becauſe like cuſtome hath the Biſhop of Rome.

Which canon is reported in the councell of Carthage, and there vttered in plaine tearmes. *Conc. carth. 6. can. 6*

Antiquiores obtineant qui apud Egyptum ſunt, et Lybiam, et Pentapolin, ita vt Alexandrinus Epiſcopus horum omnium exhibeat ſolicitudinem, quia et vrbis Romæ Epiſcopo ſimilis mos eſt, ſimiliter autem eſt circa Antiochiam, et in cæteris provincijs priuilegia propria reſerventur metropolitanis Eccleſijs.

Let the auncient obtain which are at Egypt & Lybia, and Pentapolis, ſo that the Biſhop of alexandria may haue the charge of them all, becauſe alſo the Biſhop of Rome hath the like cuſtome. In like maner alſo, let the proper priuiledges be reſerued to metropolitain churches, about antioch and other Prouinces.

By which wordes we ſee euidently, that this auncient and famous councel maketh no other account of the church of Rome, then it doth

of other Patriarchall seats. Which *Russinus* himselfe, though reputed a great Papist, hath confessed bountifully in these words:

Ruffin, lib, 10 hist. eccles. c. 6 *Vt apud Alexandriam vel in vrbe Roma vetusta consuetudo seruetur, vt vel ille Ægypti, vel hic suburbicarum Ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat.*

That the old custome may continue, and that the Bishop of *Alexandria* may haue the charge of Egypt, as the bishop of Rome hath charg of the churches nigh to Rome.

Loe, in *Ruffinus* his daies, the Bishop of Rome had his iurisdiction limited, which extended only to certaine speciall churches of Italy. For which cause S. Hyerom, a deare friend and great fauourer of the chur. of Rome, confessed for all that, the bishop of Rome to be of no greter merite, excellency, or authority, then other Bishops are: as also that the custome of Rome, could not ouer-rule other churches.

These are S. Hieromes owne and expresse words:

Hier, epist ad Evagr, tom, 3, fol, 150 *Si auctoritas quæritur, orbis maior est vrbe. vbicunq; fuerit Episcopus, sive Rome, sive Eugubij, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegij, sive Alexandria, sive Tanis: eiusdem meriti. eiusdem est & sacerdotij potentia diuitiarum & paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum facit, caterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt. Sed dicis, quomodo Romæ ad testimonium diaconi presbyter ordinatur? quid mihi profers vnius vrbis consuetudinem?*

If we looke for authority, the world is greater than one cittie. Where soeuer a bishop shal be, whether at Rome, or at Eugubium or at constantinople, or at Rhegium, or at *Alexandria*, or at Tanis; he is of the same merite and of the same Priesthood. The magnificence of riches and the basenes of pouertie, doth make him higher or lower, but all are the successors of the apostles. But thou wilt saye, how is a Priest made at Rome by the testimonie of a Deacon? why dost thou allege vnto me the custome of one onely cittie?

Thus S. Hierome agreeth with Ruffinus, Ruffinus with the councell of Nice, and the councell of Nice with other councels, Fathers, and Scriptures. *And* all ioyntly conclude the equality of other Bish. and churches, with the bishop and church of Rome.

The 2. Conclusion.

ALL the apostles receiued their vniuersall power immediately from Christ, and not from Peter at all; and consequentlie, their Iurisdictions were no lesse ordinarie then Peters was. This to be so (though this day much impugned by the Papists) proueth a great popish Doctor Franciscus a Victoria, in these words:

Omnem

Omnem potestatem quam Apostoli habuerunt, receperunt immediatè à Christo. *Victor. de potest eccles, relect. 2 conc. 3. p. 84*

All power which the apostles had, they receiued it immediatlie frō christ.

And in another place, the said *Victoria* hath these words:

Lex iniusta Episcopi non obligat, ergo nec Papæ. Antecedens est notum, & concessum ab omnibus, & consequentia videtur nota, quia non habet maiorem auctoritatem Papa ad inferendum iniuriam, quam Episcopus, circa ea enim quæ sunt sui officij, & in proprios subditos, non minus potest quàm Papa. *Victo. de potest papæ & conc. relict, 4p, 157*

The vniust law of the Bishop doth not binde a man, *ergo* neyther doth the vniust law of the Pope bind a man. The antecedent is known and granted of al, and the consequence seemeth manifest, because the Pope hath no more auctoritie to do an iniury, then hath the bishoppe. For in those things which pertein to his office, and to his proper subiects, he can do as much as the pope.

Lo, this great learned Papist, who for his learning is reuerenced of all Papists in the world ascribeth no lesse auctority to euerye Bishop in his dioceſie, then to the pope himself. Againe, he affirmeth that no bishops authority is dependent vppon the Pope, but is immediately from Christ: so that papistry is stil confuted and confounded by it self, and that by the best doctors of greatest auctoritie, euen in the church of Rome. *Ioſephus Angles*, though otherwise he flatter the Pope & aduance his auctoritie, yet hath Gods spirit enforced him to testifie the same truth. These be his words:

Si comparemus B. Petri & aliorum Apostolorum potestatem ad gubernationem omnium credentium, tantam alij Apostoli habuerunt potestatem quantā B. Petrus habuit, ita quod poterant quemlibet Christianum totius orbis, sicut modo Rom. Pont. excommunicare & in qualibet Ecclesia Episcopos et sacerdotes creare. ratio est, quia omnis potestas B. Petro promissa et tradita fuit et cæteris Apostolis collata, et hoc sine personarum, loci, vel fori discrimine. *Ioseph. Angles in 4. S. q. de clavib. dif. 2. con. prima p. 6.*

If we compare the power of S. Peter & of the other apostles, to the gouernor of al the faithful: other apostles haue euen as much power as S Peter had, so that they could then excommunicate euery christian in the whole world, as the bishop of Rome doth now, & also make bishops and priests in euery church. The reason is, because al power promised and giuen to S. Peter, was also giuen to the rest of the apostles, and that without difference of persons, place or consistory.

This is the sentence of fryer *Ioseph*, who vnwittingly and vnwillingly,

Magna est veritas & prævalet. (such is the force of veritie,) doeth wonderfully aduance the trueth, euen while he seeketh to oppugne the same.

3 Esdræ 4, 42 For first, he graunteth that euery Apostle had as much authority as S. Peter.

Secondly, that euery Apostle had then as much authoritie as the Pope challengeth now.

Thirdly, that euery Apostle had authoritie from Christe, to create Priests and Bishops euery where.

Fourthly, that all this their authoritie was giuen them, without difference of person, place, or consistorie.

O merciful God, blessed be thy holy Name for euer: such is the maiestie of thy holy Gospell, that the enimies thereof iustly infatuated for their sins, do vnwares euen then illustrate thy trueth, when they think the most to obsure the same. This I did not see, O God, when I was abandoned from thee: this I nowe behold, O God, when thou of thy mercie hast called me to thee. Grant, O sweet Father, that all seduced Papists may behold the same with me, to the glorie of thy holy Name, the honour of thy Church, and the eternal solace of their owne soules. For more then the Popes owne deare doctours do teach vs, we desire not at the Popes hands. The generall Councels of Constance and Basil, decreed this matter in these manifest tearmes.

Const. con. sess. 4 & Basil conc. Sess. 1 & 3. *Ipsa synodus in spiritu Sancto legitimè congregata generale concilium faciens, & Ecclesiam militantem representans, potestatem immediatè à Christo habet.*

The Synode lawfully assembled in the holy Ghost, making a generall Councell, and representing the Church militant, hath power immediately from Christ.

Thus saith the Councel, and doubtlesse where power commeth immediately from Christ, it cannot be deriued from the Pope. Thirdly, S. Paul had speciall authoritie ouer the Gentiles, and largely as much as Peter, if not more: and consequently, since all Christians now, were Gentiles then: the Pope if hee will needes haue superioritie ouer his brethren Bishoppes, must reduce his succession from S. Paul. For thus saith S. Paul of himselfe: The Gospell of the vncircumcision was committed to me, euen as the Gospell of circumcision to Peter. *Gal. 2, 7*

The third Conclusion.

KIngs haue power coactiue ouer Popes, but Popes haue no coactiu power ouer Kinges: albeit Popes of late daies, haue not onely excom-

communicated Princes, but depoſed them alſo. For proofe of this concluſion, many textes of holy Scripture are conſonant. King Salomon depoſed Abiathar, and placed Sadock in his roome. For ſo the booke of Kings ſaith:

Abiathar quoque Sacerdoti dixit rex, vade in Anathoth ad agrum tuum, & quidem vir mortes es, ſed hodie te non interficiam, quia portaſti arcam domini dei coram Dauid patre meo, & ſuſtinuiſti laborem in omnibus, in quibus laborauit pater meus. Eiecit ergo Saloman Abiathar, vt non eſſet ſacerdos domini. & paulo poſt: & Sadoc ſacerdotem poſuit pro Abiathar. 3 Reg. 2 verſe 27 and 35

Then the King ſaide to Abiathar the prieſt, goe to Anathoth vnto thin own farm, for thou art worthy to dy, but I wil not this day kil thee becauſe thou bareſt the Ark of the Lord god before Dauid my father, and becauſe thou haſt ſuffered in all where my father hath been afflicted. Salomon therefore caſt out Abiathar from being prieſte vnto the Lord, and ſet Sadock the prieſt in the roome of Abiathar.

King Ioſaphat apointed both Eccleſiaſtical and ſecular Magiſtrates, commanding them ſtrictly to looke vnto their charge. Theſe be the words of holy writ:

In Hieruſalem quoque conſtituit Ioſaphat Leuitas & ſacerdotes, & principes familiarium ex Iſrael, vt iudicium & cauſam domini iudicarent habitatoribus eius. Præciptq; eis dicens: ſic agetis in timore domini fideliter, & corde perfecto. 2 Par. 19, 8, 9

King Ioſaphat appointed in Hieruſalem, Leuites and prieſtes, and princes of the families of Iſraell, that they ſhoulde iudge the iudgement and cauſe of the Lord to the inhabitants thereof. And he commanded them, ſaying: Thus ſhall ye do in the feare of the Lord, faithfully and with a perfect heart.

And it followeth in theſe words:

Omnem cauſam quæ venerit ad vos fratrum veſtorum qui habitant in vrbibus ſuis, inter cognationem & cognationem, vbicunq; queſtio eſt de lege, de mandato, de cæremonijs, de iuſtificationibus, oſtendite eis vt non peccent in Dominum. 2 Par. 19, 10

Euerie cauſe which ſhall come vnto you of your brethren which dwell in their cities, betweene kindred and kindred, whereſoeuer queſtion is of the law, of commandement, of ceremonies, of iuſtifications, tell them that they ſinne not againſt the Lord. It followeth thus:

Amarias autem ſacerdos et pontifex veſter, in his quæ ad deum pertinent, præſidebit: porro Zadabias filius Iſmael qui eſt dux in domo Iuda, ſuper ea opera erit quæ ad regis officium pertinent. 2 Par, 19, 11

Amarias the prieſt and your Biſhop, ſhall beare rule in thoſe thinges which

which pertaine to God: and Zabadias ſonne of Iſmael captaine in the houſe of Iuda, ſhall be ouer thoſe workes which belong to the office of the King.

*T*heſe are the expreſſe words of holy Scripture, which I haue alleadged at large, becauſe if they be once applied effectually, they cannot but proue my opinion fully.

First therefore, as the Kings moſt excellent Maieſty that now is appointeth Biſhops and Prieſts: ſo king Ioſaphat appointed the prieſts and Leuits, ſo king Salomon appointed Sadock.

Secondly, as his Maieſtie deposeth Prieſts: ſo king Salomon deposed Abiathar.

*T*hirdly, as his Maieſty commaundeth his Biſhops in Englande: to preach the Goſpel, to adminiſter the ſacraments, to reforme abuſes, & to execute cenſures Eccleſiaſtical according to the ſcriptures: ſo commanded king Ioſaphat his Prieſts in Ieruſalem: to decide all controuerſies ariſing about the law, about commandements, about ceremonies, about iuſtifications, and to teach his people their duety therein.

Fourthly, as king Ioſaphat appointed Amarias ruler in ſpiritual cauſes, and Zabadias gouernor in ſecular affaires, diſtinguiſhing their offices, & limiting their iuriſdictions: ſo doth hys Maieſty refer Eccleſiaſtical affaires to hys clergie men, and matters of ſtate to his lords, neither confounding their functions not diſabling their perſons.

Fifdly, as King Ioſaphat did neither bear the *Ark*, not burne incenſe, nor offer vp ſacrifice, nor initiate his prieſts; ſo neither doth his Maieſtie preach the Goſpell, adminiſter the Sacrament, conſecrate his Biſhops, or perſonally execute any churchly function. *And* therfore are the Ieſuite Bellarmine his words moſt abſurd, when he ſaith:

Bellar. lib. 1 de notis eccle. c. 9 pa 102.

Et iam reipſa Caluiniſtis in Anglia, mulier quædam eſt ſummus pontifex.

And now in very deede, a woman is Pope of the *C*aluiniſtis in Englande.

He might more probably haue ſaid, that a woman was once Pope to Romiſh Ieſuits his brethren. For ſo much as he may read this, painted vppon the church wals in *S*yenna: which in the late repairing of that famous church, the Biſhop would not ſuffer to be defaced, albeit the Ieſuits made ſuch requeſt vnto him. I wil omit to ſpeak of K. Dauid, king Ioſias, K. Ezechias, and others; who al practiſed like iuriſdiction in Eccleſiaſtical affaires: one onely text of the ſcripture ſhalbe ſufficient, with Popiſh gloſſes vpon the ſame. *T*hus therſore is it written by

1 Par. 23
2 Par. 35
2 Par. 31

the

the holy Prophet, *To thee, to thee alone haue I ſinned.* Where the gemination of (to thee) after the Hebrew manner and cuſtome, argueth the vehemencie of the ſubiection and grauitie of the treſpaſſe: that is, Dauid being king, ſinned onely to the king of all kinges, God himſelfe. Which Euthimius in his gloſſe vpon the ſame wordes, confirmeth in this manner. Pſalm. 51 *Euthimius, in Pſal. 50*

Tibi ſoli peccaui, cum ſim rex & te ſolum commiſſorum à me ſcelerum iudicem habeam, tibi ſoli peccaſſe videor, hoc eſt, tibi ſoli iudici ſubiicior, caterorum enim omnium ego dominus ſum, & ob potentiam meam, licere mihi videntur quæcunque libuerint.

To thee only haue I ſinned: becauſe being a king, and hauing thee only iudge ouer my treſpaſſes, I ſeem to haue ſinned to thee only: that is, I am onely ſubiect to thee, as to my iudge. For I am lord ouer all others, and in reſpect of my magnificence, whatſoeuer doeth pleaſe me, ſeemeth to be lawfull for me.

Raynerius Snoygoudanus and diuers others, haue ſet downe the like interpretation, vpon this portion of ſcripture. The popiſh gloſſe vpon the ſame text, hath theſe words: *Gloſſa ordin. in pſal. 50*

Tibi ſoli, quia rex omnibus ſuperior, tantum à deo puniendus eſt.

To thee onely, becauſe the king is aboue all men, and can onely be puniſhed of God.

Nicolaus Lyranus a man of no ſmall account with the papiſts gloſſeth the ſaid text in this manner: *Lyranus in Pſal. 50*

Tibi ſoli peccaui, ſcilicet tanquam iudici & punire potenti: peccauerat enim contra Vriam, & alios occaſione huius interfectos, tamen quia erat rex, non habebat iudicem ſuperiorem qui poſſet eum punire niſi Deum.

To thee only haue I ſined: that is to ſay, to thee only as to the iudge and him that can punniſh. For he had now ſinned againſt Vrias and others, whome he cauſed to be murdered by that occaſion: but becauſe he was a king, he had no ſuperior iudge that could puniſh him, ſaue God alone.

What can be more plainly ſpoken? for if none but God be ſuperior to the King? if none but God can iudge the King? if none but God cā punniſh the King? (all which the Popes owne doctors affirm) then doubtles, can not the pope depoſe the King. The King therefore by popiſh reſolution, is greater and aboue the Pope. Yea, which is wonderfull: Thomas Aquinas, who is as it were the platforme and pattern, or *Idea*: according to which the Popes of late yeares do faſhion & frame their

lawes, and whose doctrin is as the Gospel with the Papists, doth confirme Lyra his expolition in these words:

Aquinas 12. quast. 96, ar. 5 ad. 3

Tibi soli peccaui: dicit glossa, quod rex non habet hominem, qui sua facta diiudicet: sed quantum ad vim directiuam legis, princeps subditur legi propria voluntate.

To thee only haue I sinned, the glosse saith, the King hath no man, that can iudge his doings: but yet touching the directiue force of the law, the Prince is subiect of his owne accord vnto the law.

Which Victoria vttereth wisely and learnedly, in these words:

victor. de potest. ciuili. relect. 3. pag. 120

Leges latæ à rep. obligant omnes, ergo etiam si ferantur à rege, obligant ipsum regem, & confirmatur, quia in aristocratico principatu senatus consulta obligant ipsos senatores auctores illorū: & in populari regimine plebi scita obligant ipsum populum: ergo similiter, leges regiæ obligant ipsum regem, & licet sit voluntarium regi condere legem, tamen non est in voluntate sua non obligari aut obligari, sicut in pactis: libere enim quisquis paciscitur, pactis tamen tenetur.

Lawes which the common-weale maketh, binde all: therefore if the King make them, they bind him also. And it is confirmed, because in the aristocraticall gouernment, the lawes of the senate bind the senatours the auctors therof: and in popular regiment, the decrees of the cōmon people bind the people: *ergo* in like manner, the kings lawes binde the King. And although the King make lawes voluntarie, yet is it not in his will to be bound or vnbound, as in couenants: for euery one maketh couenants voluntarily, and yet is euery one bounde by his couenants.

Ambrose who freeth kings from all lawes made by man, shall conclude this point. Thus doth he write:

Amb. l. de apo. David cap. 4

Qui tenentur legibus, audent suum negare peccatum, dedignantur rogare indulgentiam: quam petebat qui nullus tenebatur legibus humanis.

They that are bound to lawes, dare denie their sinne, and disdaine to aske forgiuenes: which he desired, that was bound to no law of man.

And againe, he saith:

Ibid. cap. 10

Rex vtique erat, nullus ipse legibus tenebatur: neque enim vllis ad pœnam vocantur legibus, tuti imperij potestate, homini ergo non peccauit, cui non tenebatur obnoxius.

He was indeed a king, he was bound to no lawes: for kings being free by the power of Empire, are not punnished by any lawes. He therfore sinned not to man, to whome he was not subiect.

Most impudent therefore and intollerable, is the Popes insolencie: when

when hee exalteth himselfe aboue Kinges and Emperours, threatning them that he can depose them from their scepters & regalities, and dispossesse them of their Empires and dominions. Which for al that, Cardinall Allen is not ashamed to avouch with lying lips, in the Popes behalfe: in that his disloyal pamphlet, which he published without name in defẽce of the Seminaries. But such flattery of fained titles, a Pope of famous memorie shal confute. Gregorie surnamed the great, himselfe being Pope of Rome: at what time as he was appointed by Mauricius the Emperor, to publish a certaine law sent him from the Eemperour: did not refuse to accõplish the said Emperors assignment, but acknowledged him by dutie bound to execute his commandement therin: albeit he thought the law in some parte, disagreable to Gods will. This to be so, the Popes owne words shall witnesse, which be these.

Ego quidem iussioni subiectus, eandem legem per diuersas terrarum partes transmitti feci: & quia lex ipsa omnipotenti Deo minime concordat, ecce: per suggestionis meæ paginam, serenissimis dominis nunciavi · vtrobique ergo quæ debui exolui, qui & Imperatori obedientiam præbui, & pro deo quod sensi minime tacui. Greg. lib. 2 ep. extegist indic. 11. epist. 62. cap. 100

I subiect to your commandement, haue caused the same law to be sent through diuerse parts of the land: and because the law doeth not agree with Gods will: beholde, I haue intimated so much vnto your Maiestie by my epistle: I haue therefore discharged my dutie in both respects, as who haue yeilded my obedience vnto the Emperour, neither concealed what I thought, in Gods behalfe.

These are the Popes words, besides many others in the same epistle to the like effect. Which being vttered by the chiefest Pope, are most effectuall to proue the subiection of Popes vnto Kings.

For first, Pope Gregorie acknowledgeth the Emperor, to be his lord.

Secondly, he confesseth himselfe to be the Emperours subiect.

Thirdly, he granteth that he oweth loyall obedience to the Emperor: for which duty, he durst not but publish the Emperors law though in some sort, it were verie rigorous: and that least he shoulde haue bin guiltie of disloyaltie towards his Prince.

Now that Romish pontificalitie, and pomp of Poperie came vp first by beggerly Canonists: who to aduãce them selues, flattered the Pope, and gaue him more then princely titles: the Popes own deare doctor, (who carieth therefore credit on his backe,) telleth vs, who after he hath rehearsed many lordly titles, and more thẽ royal power, ascribed to the Pope: hath these expresse words:

vict.de potest, Eccl.relect. 1 sect.6,pag.39

Sed glossatores iuris hoc dominium dederunt Papæ, cum ipsi essent pauperes rebus & doctrina.

But the glossers of the Popes lawe, gaue this dominion (and these royall tytles) vnto the Pope, when themselues were blind bayardes, and beggerly fellowes.

Thus saith the Popes doctor: and thus we see, that pouerty and ignorance, were the beginning of Popedome. For by reason of pouertie, they flattered and sought to please: and by reason of their ignorance, they auouched many things which they did not vnderstand.

The 4. Conclusion.

THe Pope had no authority to giue dominion of the Indians to the K. of Spain, albeit many defend the spanish invasion, by vertue of that donation. The later part hereof, *Victoria* sheweth in these words:

Victor.relect. quinta, de Indis pag.118.

Secundus titulus qui prætenditur, & quidem vehementur asseritur ad instam possessionem illarum prouinciarum, est ex parte summi Pontificis. dicunt enim quod summus Pontifex est Monarcha & etiam temporalis in toto orbe, & per consequens quod potuit constituere Hispanarum reges principes illorum barbarorum, & ita factum est.

The second title which is pretended and earnestly affirmed, for the iust possession of those Prouinces, consisteth in the Popes graunt. For say they, the Pope is a temporall Monarch, even of the whole world: and consequently, that he coulde appoint the King of Spaine, Prince ouer those Barbarians, and so it came to passe.

The former part of the Conclusion, Aquinas proueth in these very words:

Aquinas 22. quæst.12,ar.2 in corp.

Ad Ecclesiam autem non pertinet punire infidelitatem in illis, qui nunquam fidem susceperunt, secundum illud Apostoli, 1. Cor. 5. quid mihi de his qui foris sunt iudicare?

But it belongeth not to the Church, to punnish infidelity in them, who neuer receiued the faith, according to that saying of the apostle; What haue I to doe to iudge of those, that be not in the church.

Dominicus Soto is of the same opinion, whose words are these:

Soto in 4.dist. 5 ar.10. in med. art.

Ad hoc autem respondetur, in primis Pontificem neque concessisse, imò vero neq; (vt eum omni reverentia & obedientia de sanctissimo Christi vicario loquar) concedere potuisse eorum suorumve bonorum dominium, quasi dominium in eos ipse haberet.

But to this I answer (be it spoken with all reuerence and obedience to the most holy vicar of Christ) that neither the Pope did grant, yea neither

neither could he grant vnto the king of Spayne, dominion ouer those Indians or their goods: as though himselfe had dominion ouer them.

It followeth in the same Soto:

Lex fidei Dominium rerum ab infidelibus non auferit, quod sibi natura concessit.

The law of fayth doth not take away dominion of possesions from Infidels, which nature hath granted them.

Victoria accordeth to Aquinas and Soto in these words:

Ex quo patet, quod nec ista titulus est idoneus contra barbaros, vel quia papa dederit provincias illas tanquam dominus absolute, vel quia non recognoscēt dominium Papæ. *Victor. in relect. 5. de Indis, pag. 193*

Whereby it is plaine, that neither this tytle is sufficient against the Barbarians: either because the Pope gaue those Prouinces, as beeing absolute lord thereof: or for that they doe not recognize, the Popes auethority.

Iosephus Angles likewise saith:

Hinc neq; poterit alicui regi Christiano potestatem dare, vt sibi Indorum regna vsurpet, non enim est orbis temporalis dominus. *Ioseph Angles de sacram. ord. pag. 518*

For this cause he cannot giue any Christian king auethority to vsurp the kingdomes of the Indians to himselfe: for he is not the temporall lord of the world.

By which testimonies it is cleare, that the Pope could not giue to the Spanish king any iust tytle ouer the Indians, because he could not giue that which himselfe had not. Yet must Emperors hold his bridle, and kings be his footstoole, if they will.

THE COROLLARIE.

FIrst therefore, since all the Apostles were equal with Peter in power, authority, and Iurisdiction: secondly, since all the apostles receiued their power immediatly from Christ: thirdlye, since all the apostles had ordinarie calling and Iurisdiction, as well as Peter had: fourthly, since kings have power coactiue ouer Popes, & not Popes ouer kings: fiftly, since the popes pretended power, is controlled by his own popish doctors.

I conclude, that it is a sufficient Motiue for me to renounce the Romish Religion, as false, erroneous and pernitious doctrine.

Thus much of the fist Motiue.

The seuenth Chapter.

Of Popish Purgatorie, with circumstances thereto belonging.

THe Papistes dreaming vppon mans iustification by his owne good deeds, and consequently imagining no glorification before condigne satisfaction for euill deeds: haue inuented a purgation satisfactorie in the life to come, that so such as depart this life without complete satisfaction: may accomplish that which wanteth, in their purging fire. For confutation wherof, I put downe conclusions.

The 1. Conclusion.

EVerye one in what state hee dieth, remaineth in the same worlde without end. For probation of this conclusion, Ecclesiastes writeth in this manner:

Eccle. 11,3,4 *Si ceciderit lignum ad Austrum, aut ad Aquilonem, in quocunque loco cecide rit, ibi erit.*

If wood shall fall to the South, or to the North; in what place soeuer it shall fall, there shall it be.

Christ himselfe confirmeth the same in these expresse words:

Matth. 25,46 *Et ibunt hi in supplicium aternum, iusti autem in vitam aternam.*

And these shall go to eternall punishment, but the iust to life euerlasting.

And in another place, he hath these words:

Apoc. 14, 13 *Beati mortui qui in domino moriuntur, amodo iam dicit spiritus vt à laboribus requiescant suis.*

Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, for from henceforth saith the spirit, They shall rest from their labours.

Which saying Saint. Cyprian explicateth in moste manifest termes.

Cypr. in serm. de mortalit. circa medium. *Qualem te inuenit Deus cum vocat, talem pariter & iudicat.*

As God findeth thee when he caleth, so doth he iudge thee.

And in another place he hath these most excelent and goldē words.

Hortandi sunt, inquit, dum facultas adest, dum adhuc aliquid de seculo super est, deo satis facere, & ad veræ religionis candidam lucem de profundo tenebrosæ superstitionis emergere.

Et paulo post. *Quem istinc excessum fuerit, nullus iam locus pœnitentiæ est, nullus satisfactionis effectus. Hic vita aut amittitur, aut tenetur, hic salus aternæ cultu dei & fructu fidei prouidetur. Nec quisquam aut peccatis retarde-*

tur

tur aut annis, quo minus veniat ad consequendam salutem. In ista adhuc mundo manenti, pœnitentia nulla sera est: patet ad indulgentiam aditus, quærentibus atq; intelligentibus veritatem facilis accessus est.

We exhort, saith he, to satisfie God while we may, while we are in this world, and to come from the deapth of darke superstition to the bright light of true religion. When wee shall goe hence, there is no place of repentance, no effect of satisfaction. Here life is eyther loste or woon, here prouision is made for eternall life, by the seruice of god and fruit of fayth. No man is hindred through his sinnes or yeares, but that he may attaine salvation. While one is in this world, no repentance is to late: the gate is open to pardon, the accesse is easie to such as seeke and vnderstand the truth.

Saint Ambrose writeth in this maner:

Qui enim hic non accipit remissionem peccatorum, illic non erit. Non erit autem, quia ad æternam vitam non poterat peruenire, quia vita æterna est remissio peccatorum: ideoq; dicit (David) remitte mihi (peccata) vt refrigerer, prius quam abeam. Ambr. tom. 2 lib de bono mortis, cap. 2.

He that receiueth not remission of sinnes here, shal not come there: and he shall not be there, because he cannot come to eternall life, for that eternall life is remission of sinnes.

And therefore sayth David, Forgiue me my sinnes, that I may bee refreshed before I goe hence.

Saint Hierome hath these words:

Dum estis in hoc seculo, hortor vos agere pœnitentiam. Confitemini ergo Domino, quoniam in isto tantum seculo misericors est. Hic misereri potest pœnitenti, quia ibi iudex est, non est misericors. Hic misericors est, ibi iudex est. hic porrigit manum cadenti, ibi sedet iudex, Hier. in Psal. 105

While you are in this world, I exhort you to do pennance. Confes therefore vnto the Lord, because he is mercifull in this world onelye, Here he can shew mercy to the penitent: there because hee is Iudge, he is not mercifull. Here he is mercifull, there he is iudge. Heere hee reacheth his hand to him that falleth, there he sitteth Iudge.

Againe, the said Saint Hierome writeth thus in another place:

Obscure licet dicemur, per hanc sententiolam novum dogma quod latitat: dū in præsenti sæculo sumus, sive orationibus, sive consilijs inuicem posse adiuuari. Cum autem ad tribunal Christi venerimus, non Iob, non Daniel, non Noe, rogare posse pro quoquam, sed vnumquenq; portare sum onus. Hier. tom. 5 ad Gal. cap. 6

We are taught here though obscurely, a newe doctrine that is hid:

that

that while we are in this worlde, one may helpe another, either by his praier or counsel. But whē we shal come to the tribunal seat of Christ, then neither Iob, nor Daniel, nor Noe, can make intercession for any man, but euerie one must beare his owne burden.

Augustine is of the same iudgement in many places of his workes:

Aug. in psal. 36. conc. 1 *Tuus certe dies vltimus, longe abesse non potest. Ad hunc te præpara: qualis enim exieris de hac vita, talis redderis illi vitæ.*

The last day doubtles can not be farre hence: prepare thy selfe for it. For as thou shalt departe out of this life, so shalt thou bee restored to that life.

Againe, in another place:

August. in q. evang q. 38 to. 4. pag. 249 *Quod autem dicit ad ea loca in quibus torquentur Impij, iustos etiam si velint non posse transire: quid aliud significat, nisi post hanc vitam ita receptis in carcere, vt inde non exeunt donec reddat nouissimum quadrantem, per incommutabilitatem diuinæ sententiæ, nullum auxilium misericordiæ posse præberi a iustis, etiamsi velint illud præbere.*

In that hee saieth, to those places in which the wicked are tormented, the iuste can not come though they woulde, what other thinge doeth hee signifie, but the immutabilitie of Gods sentence to be such, as the iust, though most willing, can yeild no helpe of mercie after this life to those that be so in prison, as they can not gette out till they pay the last farthing.

Againe, in another place:

Aug. de fide ad Petrum, c 3 circa medium. *Ille autem iudex nouit quantam vnicuique sit daturus gloriam, qui in hac vita per misericordiam gratis iustificando præuenit, quos illic per iustitiam glorificare disposuit, tempus vero acquirendæ vitæ æternæ in ista tantum vita deus hominibus dedit, vbi voluit etiam pœnitentiam esse fructuosam.*

That iudge knewe how much glorie he woulde giue to euerie one, who preuented by iustifying freely in this life through mercie, whom he disposed to glorifie in the other by iustice but time to attaine eternall life God granted to men in this life onely, where he woulde haue penance to be of force.

The second Conclusion.

CHristes blood is the true and onely purgatorie for many sinnes, as wel *quoad pœnam*, as *quoad culpam*: that is, both concerning the sin, and punnishment due for the same. This conclusion S. Paul maketh plaine, writing thus to the Hebrewes.

Qui cum sit splendor gloriæ & figura substantiæ eius, portansque omnia ver-

verbo virtutis ſua, purgationem peccatorum faciens, ſedet ad dexteram maieſtatis in excelſis.

Who being the brightnes of his glorye, and the figure of his ſubſtance, and ſuſteining all things by the word of his power: did by him ſelfe purge our ſins, and ſitteth on the right hand of maieſty on high. Hebr. 1,2,3

And in another place, he layth thus:

In quo habemus redemptionem & remiſſionem peccatorum. Coloſſ, 1, 16

In whom we haue redemption and remiſsion of our ſinnes.

Againe, in another place:

Hi ſunt qui venerunt de tribulatione magna, & lauarunt ſtolas ſuas, & dealbaverunt eas in ſanguine agni. Apoc. 7, 14

Theſe are they that came from great tribulation, and waſhed their ſtoles, and made them white in the bloud of the lambe.

Againe in another place:

Sanguis Ieſu Chriſti, emundat nos ab omni peccato. 1 Iohn 1, 8

The bloud of Ieſus Chriſt, doth purge vs from all ſinne.

Againe in another place: 2 Cor. 5, 21

Is qui non noverat peccatum, peccatum pro nobis fecit, vt nos efficeremur iuſtitia dei in ipſo.

He that knew not ſinne, ſuffered paine due for ſinne for vs, that we might be made the jvſtice of God in him.

Againe. Eſai, 43, 25.

Ego ſum, ego ſum ipſe, qui delio iniquitates tuas propter me.

I, even I am he that blot out thine iniquities (not for thy deſertes, but for mine owne ſake.

Againe in another place:

Ipſe vulneratus eſt propter iniquitates noſtras, attritus eſt propter ſcelera noſtra. Eſai, 23, 5

He was wounded for our iniquities, he was torne in peeces for our offences.

Againe in another place:

Chriſtus non redemit de maledicto leges, factus pro nobis maledictam. Galat. 3, 13

Chriſt redeemed vs from the curſſe of the law, being a curſſe for vs.

Neither will it helpe the Papiſts to anſwere, that theſe textes of Scripture are vnderſtood only of the guilt of ſinne, and not of the puniſhment due for the ſame.

For firſt, no ſcripture maketh that diſtinction between the guilt of ſinne and puniſhment correſpondent to the ſame.

2 Secondly, no ancient writer did euer so expound such texts of scripture.

3 Thirdly, because their own doctor Aquinas auoucheth our redeemer to haue suffred not onely for the guilt of our sinnes, but also for the punishment due vnto the same. These be his words:

Aquinas in part 3.q.15, art.1,ad.5

Christus dedit maximum exemplum pœnitentibus, dum non pro peccato proprio, sed pro peccatis aliorum voluit pœnam subire.

Christ gaue an exceding great example to penitent sinners, while his pleasure was to sustaine punishment, not for his owne sin, (which was none at all,) but for the sinnes of others.

And Saint *Augustine* writing vpon the Psalmes hath these words:

Aug. in ps 129 to.8.pa.1036

Ergo apud te est propitiatio, nam si non esset apud te propitiatio, si iudex solum esse velles, & misericors esse nolles, si observares omnes iniquitates nostras, & quæreres eas quis sustineret? quis ante te staret & diceret innocens sum? quis staret in iudicio tuo? ses ergo vna est, quoniam apud te est propitiatio.

Therfore with thee is mercy: for if there were not mercy with thee, if thou wouldst onely bee our iudge, and not shewe vs mercy, if thou wouldest looke into our iniquities, and seeke them, who were able to abide it? who could stand before thee, and say, I am innocent? who could stand in thy iudgement? Therefore there is one onely hope, because with thee mercie is to be found.

and the same S. *Augustin* in another place, hath yet more plain words:

Dominus noster Iesus Christus morivenit, peccare non venit, communicando nobiscum sine culpa pœnam, & culpam solvit & pœnam.

Aug. ser. 141. de temp. to. 10

Our Lord Iesus (saith saint *Augustine*) came to die, he came not to sinne, communicating paine with vs without sin, he loosed both the sinne and paine of sinne.

4 Fourthly, because it would follow thereupon, that Christs workes were verie vnperfect: and yet doth the scripture say:

Deut. 32,4

Dei perfecta sunt opera.

The works of God are perfect.

But doubtlesse, he wrought not mans redemption perfectly if mans satisfaction must concurre to the perfection thereof: and yet concurre it must perforce if another purgation be established in purgatorie fire, besides that purgation which Christs bloud hath wrought.

5 Fiftly, because Christs satisfaction otherwise had bin in vaine. For if we can satisfy for our selues, or by the help of our neighbors in purgatorie fire: then did Christ in vaine satisfie for vs vpon ỹ crosse: then

did

did not Christ loose both the sinne and paine of sinne, as S. *Augustine* auoucheth.

6 Sixtly, because our satisfaction speaking of the best, is not, nor can be infinite: and consequently, cannot make compensation for infinit transgression.

For as Aquinas saith:

Aquinas 3.p. quest. 1. ar. 2 ad. 2

Peccatum contra Deum admissum, quandam infinitatem habet ex infinitate divinæ maiestatis. tanto enim offensa est grauior, quanto maior est ille in quem delinquitur.

Sinne committed against God is infinite, by reason of his infinite Maiesty: For so much is the offence greater, by how much he is greater against whom we sinne.

7 Seuenthly, because it is flatly against the opinions of the holy Fathers. Thus saith Saint *Augustine:*

Aug. 5. hypognost, vltra med ser. 14. de verb apost. l. 1. c. 28 de peccatorum merit & remis

Primum locum fides catholicorũ diuina authoritate credit, regum scelerum: secundum gehennam, vbi omnis apostata vel à fide Christi alienus, æterna supplicia experietur: tertium penitus ignoramus, imo nec in script. sanctis inueniemus

The faith of Catholiks by Gods authoritie, beleeueth the first place to be the kingdome of heauen: the second place to be hell, where euery apostata or Infidel shalbe punished everlastingly: the 3. place we are vtterly ignorant of, neither shall we find it in the holy scriptures.

Which assertion saint *Augustine* doth often inculcate, in sundry of his bookes. Saint Hierome likewise teacheth vs, that after the separation of the soule from the body, there is no resting place, but eyther heauen or hell. These are his wordes:

Hier. in c. 9 Amos prope mid. capitis

Quum anima vinculis laxata corporis, volandi quo velit, sive quo inre compellitur, habuerit libertatem: aut ad inferna ducetur, de quibus scriptum est: in inferno quis confitebitur tibi? aut certe ad cœlestia sublevabitur.

When the soule shalbe loosed from corporall bonds, and shall haue libertie to go whither it will, or whither it is compelled to go: either it shall be brought to the infernall spirits, of whom it is written, in hel who will confesse vnto thee? or doubtlesse it shall be exalted to heauen aboue. To conclude, their famous bishop and holie martyr Rossensis, confessing the late originall of Popish Pardons, among other reasons, yeeldeth this for one:

Ros. apud Dom Soto in 4. sent. di 21. q 2, ar. 3

Quarum prima est, quod olim non erat vsque ad eo ecclesiæ notum purgatorium. Imo Græcis inquit, adhuc vsque diem non est creditum.

Whereof the first reason is, that in old time, purgatorie was not so wel

knowen vnto the church, yea saith he, the Greekes doe not to this day beleeue it.

And doubtlesse if there were any purgatorie besides Christ passion, the thiefe that liued wickedly to the last houre, should haue had his part therein; who yet went incontinently to paradise, as saith the holy scripture.

What madde men are we, who nowe make that an article of our beleefe, that was neuer beleeued in the ancient catholike church, as witnesseth their great popish bish.

The 3. Conclusion.

AFter this life is neither place to merit, demerit, or satisfaction. This conclusion is proued out of Ecclesiasticus, where it is written.

Ante obitum tuum operare iustitiam, quia non est apud inferos inuenire cibum.

Before thy death, woorke iustice, because there is no relieefe to bee found among the dead.

Eccles. 14, 17

Correspondent hereunto is the saying of Aquinas:

Dicendum, quod mereri & demereri pertenent ad statum viæ: vnde bona in viatoribus sunt meritoria, mala vero demeritoria: in beatis autem bona non sunt meritoria, sed pertinentia ad eorum beatitudinis premium, & sic mala in damnatis non sunt demeritoria, sed pertinent ad damnationis pœnam.

Aquinas 2, q. 13. ar. 4. ad, 2 & 1. p. q 62. ar. 9. corpor.

We must answere, that to merit & demerit, pertaine to the state of the way: wherefore good works are meritorious to such as be viatores and liue in this world: and likewise euill workes demeritorious.

But in the saintes of heauen good workes are not meritorious, but appertaine to the reward of their beatitude.

And in like manner euill works in the damned are not demeritorious, but pertaine to the paine of their damnation.

Dominicus Soto commenting vpon the master of sentences, holdeth the selfe same opinion. For which cause saint Paul exhorteth vs to do good, *dum tempus habemus:* while we haue time.

Soto in 4. dist. 19. q. 3. ar. 1. ad arg 1

Galat. 6, 10

This the preacher confirmeth in these words:

Eccle. c. 9, 5

Viuentes sciunt quod morientur, & mortui ne sciunt quicquam, et non est eis amplius merces, in oblivione enim est memoria eorum.

The liuing know that they must die, and the dead know nothing at al, neither haue they henceforth a reward, for their mẽorie is forgotten.

Vppon which words saint Hieromie hath this glosse:

Hier. in 9. cap. eccles. astes.

Viventes metu mortis possunt bona opera perpetrare, mortui vero nihil valent ad id adijcere quod semel secum tulere de vita. Sed & delectio eorum, & odium, et emulatio, & omne quod in seculo habere potuerunt, mortis finitur aduentu: nec iam ipse quippe possunt agere, nec peccare, nec virtutes adijcere, nec vitia.

The liuing may do good works for feare of death: but the dead can

ad

ad nothing to that, which they once tooke with them out of this life. Their loue also and their hatred, their emulatiō and whatsoeuer they could haue in this world, all is ended with death. For they can neither do well nor sinne, neither ad vice nor vertue.

All which S. Cyprian compriſed in theſe few golden words:

Quum iſthinc exceſſum fuerit, nullus iam locus pœnitentiæ eſt, nullus ſatisfactionis effectus. *Cypr. cont. Demetr. in fine.*

When we ſhall depart out of this life, there will be no place to penance, no effect of ſatisfaction.

Saint Auguſtine teacheth the courſe of Gods iuſtice to be ſuch, as we muſt either attaine remiſsion of our ſinnes in this world, or neuer to expect the ſame.

Theſe are his wordes:

Morum porro corigendorum, nullus alius quam in hac vita locus: nam poſt hanc quiſq; id habebit, quod in hac ſibimet conquiſierit. *Aug. epiſt. 54. to 2. in initio.*

There is no other place but this life to refraine our manners: For after this life euerie one ſhall haue that, which hee purchaſed for himſelfe in this life.

Many other like ſayings the ſaid holy father hath to the like effecte and purpoſe: which I now let paſſe with ſilence, thinking that ſufficient which is already ſaid hereof.

Moſt miſerable therefore are the ſoules in popiſh purgatorie, as who by popiſh doctrine can neither merite nor ſatisfie for their ſinnes.

For if ſoules in purgatorie can ſatisfie or merite, then can they alſo demerit, (becauſe the ſelfe ſame reaſon ho deth in both alike,) and if they can demerit, they can alſo ſinne mortally, and ſo periſh eternally, contrary to popiſh doctrine.

Againe, if any mercie can be found after this life: the reaſon made by S. Paul to the Corinthians which was grounded vpon the chiefeſt miſterie of our Chriſtian faith is doubtles of no force at all: to wit, when he concludeth of the faith vpon Chriſt his reſurrection from the dead.

Thus ſtandeth the Apoſtles diſcourſe: they that die in the faith of Chriſt, are either ſaued or damned: who if they be ſaued, then is Chriſt riſen againe, and become a true ſauiour: but if they be damned, then doubtles is Chriſt not riſen againe, neither become a true ſauior. Now to confeſſe a third place, where ſoules remaine neither ſaued or damned, but in a perplexe manner, that indeed may ſtand with popiſh doctrine, but is flat againſt Saint Paules diſcourſe. *Infra cap. 9 per totum.*

Againe, to holde a third place doeth ouerthrowe another of Sainte Paules reasons, when he affirmeth the being in this bodie, to keepe the faithfull from Christ.

2 Cor.5,7,8. For if popish purgatorie be admitted, the soules suffering there shall be as well absent from Christes presence, as when they weere in Christes bodie.

But perhaps, Saint Paul knew not howe to conclude his purpose, or at least was not in loue with papistrie. Yet the papistes will say, that it is verie common with the fathers to pray for the dead.

To this I say that in verie deed it cannot be denied, but that sundrie of the fathers haue both praied themselues for the dead, and haue also aproued the praiers of others to the like end. But this wil neither establish the popish purgatorie, nor their manner of praying for the dead.

Which obection, because it seemeth to carry a great maiesty with it, and indeed seduceth many a one, (as which is plainly set down in very expresse termes, in many places of the ancient writers,) I purpose a little to stand vpon it, nothing douting but to satisfie the indifferent reader therewith through the power of God, so he will yeilde attentiue eares vnto my words. 2 Cor,15,8

I therefore say first, (as is aprooued elsewhere in this treatise,) that what writer soeuer affirmeth any doctrine, contrarie to that which is taught in the holy scriptures: he whosoeuer hee be, must be reiected, and his doctrine in that point contemned.

Which thing I do not barely say, but I haue proued the same out of the doctrine of the fathers, by the flat and expresse words of the fathers themselues, peruse the ninth chapter, of credite to be giuen to writers.

I say secondly, that it is a seemly, good, and godly maner to pray for the dead: so our harts be rightly disposed, and our praiers framed accordingly:

As for example: when it is said of some friend departed out of this life, God graunt him a ioyfull resurrection: which is the most orderly and plainest forme, of praying for the dead.

I say thirdly, if one say, God haue mercie on the soule, being wel instructed for the true sense thereof: it is not to be reproued, though the other phrase and maner of praying, ought rather to be vsed: especially in these daies, when the latter kind is commonly abused, for albeit the holy and auncient fathers, when they prayed for rest and mercie to the dead, vnderstood nothing els but the resurrection of the body, and the cõplement that redoundeth to the soule by vnion of the same: yet haue

the papists taught, and this day teach the people to vnderstand therby the mitigation of purgatorie paines: which the soules of the dead enioy (as they grosly imagine,) either by praiers of the faithfull, or by masses, trentals, and diriges, or by the popes pardons. So that the euill of this maner of praying, consisteth not in the phrase and praier it self: but in the eronious affection of the partie that so prayeth.

For the better vnderstanding whereof, we must obserue:

First, that it is lawfull to pray for such things, as are very certaine: but not yet accomplished or brought to passe.

And consequently, that it is lawfull to pray for the resurrection of the bodie: as also that the soules in the second aduent may be vnited againe to the bodies: that so the faithfull may in complete maner, be made partakers of the vision beatificall.

This obseruation is manifest by that praier which our sauiour himselfe prayed: whose actions, as writeth the apostle, are our instructiõs.

For our Lord Iesus praied for the saluation of his elect, who neither shall nor could perish by any possibility. 1 Pet. 2, 22

That he prayed for them, is manifest in these words:

Non pro mundo rogo, sed pro his quos dedisti mihi, quia tui sunt, Pater sancte, serua eos in nomine tuo, quos dedisti mihi. Ioh 17, 9, 11

I pray not for the worlde, but for those whome thou hast giuen me, because they are thine; holy father, keepe them in thy name, whome thou hast giuen me. Yea, the very elect are commaunded to praye for their saluation, because that is one of the petitions in the Lords praier, which appertaine to all, especially to the elect.

And that the elect cannot perish, is euident by this testimony of the holy gospell.

Ita vt in errorem inducantur (si fieri potest) etiam electi: Matth. 24, 24

So that the verie elect should be seduced, if it were possible.

We must obserue secondly, that in the writings of the fathers, sin is often taken for the corruption and mortality of the body: as the papistes themselues doe euer in their romish pardons, vnderstand by sin the paine due for sinne.

Which obseruations well remembred, all obiections out of the fathers, touching praying for the dead, may be answered with all facilitie. For first, when the auncient churches offered vp their sacrifices of thanksgiuing and prayers for the dead.

And secondly, when the fathers do desire eternal rest vnto the dead:

they

they desire nothing lesse, then that such soules may be deliuered out of Purgatorie, or haue remission of their sinnes.

Which thing I will proue, by two very sound foundations.

Chrysost. in liturg prope finē to. 5. p. 1377

1 The one, because such praiers or oblations were made for those, who (not only as the fathers beleeued, but even as the Papists themselues confesse) were then in heauen, where they neither needed nor could be relieued, by such prayers or oblations.

2 The other, because the fathers haue acknowledged so muche, by expresse words in their writings.

1 The former foundation is euident in the liturgy of S. Chrysostom, who there offered his sacrifice of thanksgiuing, for the Prophets, apostles, Martyrs, and for our blessed lady the holy virgin Mary. whom all I am well assured, the Papists will confesse to haue been in heauen, long afore saint Chrysostome was borne.

2 The second foundation is plainly confessed by saint *Ambrose*, who in his funerall orations for the emperors Theodosius and Valentinianus with his brother Satyrus: both confesseth them to possesse eternal rest in heauen, and neuertheless prayeth for eternal rest vnto them.

which words though they seeme to implie manifest contradiction, yet are they no lesse exact and sound then godly and easie to bee vnderstood: if my rehearsed obseruations be well marked. For though their soules were in eternall blisse, that is, in heauen: yet neither were their bodies then, neither are they now, neither shall they be, vntil the second aduent of our redeemer, in that eternall rest.

Which rest that *Valentineanus Theodosius*, and Satyrus may enioie after the day of dome in complete maner: that is, in soule and bodye vnited in perpetuall vnion: saint *Ambrose* prayed so instantlie.

Now for thy better instruction and satisfaction (gentle Reader) I will alledge saint Ambrose words, as himselfe hath vttered them.

Of his brother *Satyrus* he saith thus:

In oratione funebri pro Satyro, to. 3. in fine

Tibi nunc omnipotens Deus innoxiam commendo animam, tibi hostiam meam affero: cope propitius ac serenus fraternum munus, sacrificium sacerdotis.

To thee now, O almighty God, I commend his innocent soule: to thee I offer my oblation, accept fauourablie my brotherly present, the sacrifice of thy priest.

Of *Theodosius* he saith thus:

In oratione funeb. pro Theod. tom 3. pa. 52

Da requiem perfectam seruo tuo Theodosio, requiem illam quam preparasti sanctis tuis.

Giue

Giue perfect rest to thy seruant Theodosius, that rest which thou hast prepared for thy saintes.

Of *Valentinianus* he saith thus: ambr. de obitu Valent. pa. 12. tom. 3

Nulla dies vos silentio preteribit, nulla inhonoratos vos mea transibit oratio, nulla nox non donatas aliqua precum mearum contextione transcurret. omnibus vos oblationibus frequentabo.

No day shal passe with silence, none of mine orations shal passe without your honor, no night shall slide away without some praier of mine for you. I will frequent you with all oblations.

Thus we see plainly, that Saint Ambrose both offered sacrifice of lawde, and prayed for *Valentinianus*, *Theodosius*, and *Satyrus* beeinge dead.

Let vs now proceed a little further.

Thus saith saint *Ambrose* of *Satyrus*:

Intravit in regnum cœlorum, quoniam credidit Dei verbo.

Hee is entred into Heauen, because hee beleeued the worde of God. Ambr. vbi supra de sing.

Thus saith he of Theodosius:

Manet ergo in lumine Theodosius, & sanctorum cœtibus gloriatur. fruitur Augustæ memoriæ Theodosius luce perpetua

Theodosius therefore abideth in light, and in the glory and fellowship of Saints. Theodosius of famous memory, enioyeth perpetuall light.

Thus he saith of Valentinianus:

Creaimus quia ascendit a deserto, hoc est, ex hoc arido & inculto loco ad illas florulentas delectationes, vbi cum fratre coniunctus æterna vita fruitur voluptate.

Let vs beleeue that hee is ascended from the desert: that is, from this drie and vntilled place to those florishing delectations, wherein the fellowshippe of his brother hee enioyeth the pleasure of eternall life.

These wordes are plaine, and neede no glosse. S. Ambrose then beleeued, that *Velentinianus*, *Theodosius*, and *Satyrus* were in heauen, and enioyed eternall rest: and neuertheless, euen then prayed for their eternall rest. But doubtlesse his praiers had bene both vaine and sooliſh, if he should haue prayed for that vnto them, which they had and enioyed alreadie. He therefore praied, (as my obseruations declare,) not for the rest and blisse of the soules, which them possessed eternal rest and blisse: but that the bodies also may be partakers of that place and

reſt, which they wanted then, and ſhall vntill the day of doome.

And for the better confirmation of this mine aſſertion, S. Ambroſe doth in expreſſe words ſo expound himſelfe:

Ambroſius vbi ſupra.

For thus he writeth:

Te quæſo ſummæ Deus, vt chariſſimos iuuenes matura reſurrectione reſuſcites. & immaturum hunc vitæ iſtius curſum matura reſurrectione compenſes.

O high and mighty God, I beſeech thee to raiſe vp moſt dear yong youths with mature reſurrection, & to recompence the vnripe courſe of this their life, with mature and ripe reſurrection.

Let this be well noted

Loe here in plaine and briefe tearmes, the compendious explication of that Popiſh obiection, and doubt, which ſo troubleth and ſeduceth many a one.

And ſo Saint Ambroſe his prayer for the dead, was euen this and no other: God giue them a ioyfull reſurrection.

The 4. Concluſion.

IF popiſh purgatorie were admitted to be *Κατ' ἀδυνατον*: yet woulde it follow by a neceſſarie conſequent, that the ſoules tormented ther ſhould periſh euerlaſtingly.

This concluſion is thus proued.

There is no ſaluation to be expected out of the church as witneſſeth their great councell of Lateran, and the holy fathers accorde thereunto. But ſoules boilinge in Purgatorie papiſticall, bee neither in the Churche tryumphante, becauſe there is no neede of Purgation, neyther in the Church millitant, becauſe there is place for merite and ſatisfaction: *Ergo* they be out of the Church: And conſequently without the ſtate of ſaluation: and in the ſtate of eternall damnation.

and that the beſt learned papiſtes ſtande in doubte of their ſaluation, it cannot with righte reaſon bee denied. For in theyr Maſſes of Requiem, the Prieſtes are commaunded to praye in theſe expreſſe words:

In Miſſa requiem pro defunctis.

Ne abſorbeat eas tartarus:

That hell ſwallow not them vp and deuoure them.

And doubtleſſe if they bee aſſured of their ſaluation: it is a vaine and rediculous thinge to pray, that they be not ſwallowed vp of hell: And conſequently, their holy Maſſe is farced with a bundell of vanities. Neither wil it helpe the aduerſarie to ſay, that though the ſoules

in

in their purgatorie cannot satisfie for themselues: yet may the liuing satisfie for them, which is of as muche force, as they did satisfie for themselues. For as the transgression is personall, so must the satisfaction also be.

The reason hereof is euident, because to accept ones satisfaction for another: may well stand with acceptation or mercie, but neuer with iustice.

For which iustice notwithstanding, popish purgatory was inuented, and this day is defended: as their reuerend professor of diuinitye *Dominicus Soto*, plainly testifyeth in these words:

Respondetur, quod licet tunc moriens satisfacere nequeat, culpa sua fuit, quod tempus ad id anteæ nō elegit: & ideo pœna quæ per contritionē non fuerit ei dimissa, in purgatorio est luenda: vt ratio diuinæ iustitiæ seruetur. Soto in 4. dist. 19. q. 2. ar. 5 in fine

I answere. That although he that dieth, cannot satisfie for his sins: yet was it his owne defalt, because he chose not before time for it: and therefore, the punishment which was not remitted by contrition & confession, must be punished in purgatory: that the order of Gods iustice maye be obserued.

The 5. Conclusion.

IT is euident euen by the opinion of great papists, that many soules in purgatory shall abide there for euer: and yet is that flat againste popish religion.

This conclusion shall be manifest, if I proue three points.

First, that euery [illegible] mortall. [illegible]

Secondly, that no mortall sinne can be remitted or forgiuen in Popish purgatory.

Thirdly, that many depart out of this world, not hauing theyr veniall sinnes (of the papists so termed) before remitted, or forgiuen.

For first, if euery sinne be mortall: and secondly, yf no mortall sin be forgiuen in Purgatory: & thirdly, yf sundry be in purgatory, whose sinnes be not all forgiuen: it must needs follow by a necessary sequell, that such persons muste contynue in purgatorye eternallye, because they cannot come from thence vntill their sinnes be remitted wholy.

1 First therefore, that euerye sinne is mortall, is confessed by three great Papistes: that is to saye, Roffensis, Gersonus, and Mychaell Baius.

For these three confesse plainlie, that euery sinne is mortall of it owne

owne nature, and only veniall through Gods merciful acceptation: and therefore may it be iustly punished euerlastingly.

Roff. art. 32 aduers. Luth. pag. 328

Roffensis writing against Luther, hath these expresse words:

Quod peccatum veniale solum ex dei misericordia veniale sit, in hoc tecum sentio.

That a veniall sinne is onely veniall through the mercie of God (and not of it owne nature,) therein do I agree vnto you.

Loe, my Lord of Rochester confesseth plainly, that euery sin is mortall of it owne nature.

And Ioannes Gerson sometime Chanceler of Paris, that famous vniuersity, though otherwise a greate Papist, cannot deny this verity, for these are his words:

Io. Gers de vita spirituali. lect. 1. p. 3. in 2 corollar.

Nulla offensa Dei est venialis de se, nisi tantum modo per respectum ad diuinã misericordiam, qui non vult te facto quamlibet offensam imputare ad mortem, cũ illud posset iustissime. Et ita concluditur, quod peccatum mortale & veniale in esse tali, non distinguuntur intrinsece & essentialiter, sed solum per respectum ad diuinam gratiam, qua peccatum istud imputat ad pœnam mortis, & aliud non.

No offence of God is veniall of it owne nature, but onely in respect of Gods mercy, who will not *de facto*, impute euerie offence to death, although he might most iustly doe it.

And so I conclude, that mortall and veniall sinnes as such, are not distinguished intrinsecally, and essentially: but onely in respecte of Gods grace, which assigneth this sinne to the paine of death, and not the other.

Many other sentences to the like effect the said Gerson hath, but these may suffice to content any reasonable minde.

Other papists are of the same opinion in very deed, though they doe not disclose their minds in such manifest tearmes.

Thus writeth our father Iesuit Bellarminus:

Beller. de Rom. Pontif. cap. 21

Respondeo, omne peccatum esse contra legem Dei non positiuam sed æternam, vt Aug. recte docet: omnis enim iusta lex siue a Deo, siue ab homine detur, ab æterna dei legi deriuatur: est enim æterna lex, vt malum sit violare regulam.

I answere, that euerie sinne is againste the lawe of God, not positiue, but eternall, as Augustine rightly teacheth. For euerie iuste lawe, whether it be made by God or by man, it is deriued from the law of God eternall. For the lawe eternall is, that it is sinne to transgresse the rule.

And this is the common opinion, as I haue proued out of Ioseph[us] Angles. Nei-

Neither will it helpe the papistes to say as the Thomistes doe: that veniall sinnes are *præter non contra legem*, besides the lawe, but not against the law. *Legendus est Iose. ang. sup. cap. 7, ar, 2*

First, because saint Augustine defineth sinne generally to be against the law of God, writing in this manner:

Peccatum est dictum, vel factum, vel concupitum, contra legem æternam dei. *aug. l, 22, c, 27 contra faust.*

Sinne is a saying, or dooing, or coueting, againste Gods eternal lawe.

Secondly, because as Iosephus Angles their owne doctor saith: euerie veniall sinne is against right reason, and to do against right reason, is to do against the lawe of nature, which commandeth not to departe from the rule of right reason. *Io. ang, in 4 sent. part 3, pag. 215*

Thirdly, because we must giue an accompt of euery idle word in the generall day of iudgement, as Christ himselfe telleth vs: and for no other end doubtlesse must this accompt be made, but onely beeause euerie idle word is against the law of God. Matt, 12, 36 This reason conuinceth doubtlesse.

This the papists can neuer deny, yet must they likewise confesse that idle words be those sinnes, which they terme venials: and consequently that veniall sinnes be against the law of God.

Secondly, that no mortall sin can be forgiuen in purgatorie, is confessed of all papists without contradiction.

Thus writeth Bellarminus: *bellar. lib, 2, de purgat, c, 1. in fine.*

Manet vltima sententia vera & Catholica, purgatorium pro ijs tantum esse, qui cum venialib. culpis moriuntur: & rursum pro illis qui decedunt cum reatu pœnæ, culpis iam remissis.

The true and Catholike opinion remaineth, that purgatorie is only for those, that die with veniall sins: and again, for those that die with the guilt of sin, after their sinnes be forgiuen.

And with Bellarminus do all other papists agree, that such as die in mortall sin, go incontinently to hell.

Thirdly, that sundrie hauing veniall sinnes abide the paines of purgatory, appeareth by Bellarminus his wordes before alleaged, and by Dominicus Soto in these words:

Qui dixerit verbum contra spiritum sanctum, non remittetur ei in hoc seculo, neque in futuro. Vbi Gregorius lib. 4. diologorum, adnotauit aliqua liuia peccata remitti in futuro seculo, per ignem purgationis. *Soto in 4 sent, dist. 19, q. 3*

Hee that shall blaspheame the holy Ghost, shall not be forgiuen in this world, neither in the world to come.

Idem habetur d.25.can qualis.

In which place, Gregorius Pope of Rome, noted certaine light sins to be forgiuen in the world to come, by the fire of purgation.

And their Aquinas saith thus:

Aquin.12,q. 89,ar.2,ad.4

Secundum enim quod peccata venialia sunt maioris vel minoris adhærentiæ vel grauitatis, citius vel tardius per ignem purgantur.

For veniall sinnes are purged by fire sooner or latter, according to their greater or lesser adherence or grauitie.

And for a full accomplishment of this conclusion, Iosephus Angles vttereth the great perplexitie of papistes, concerning this their purgatiue imagination.

These are his words:

Io.ang, in 4 sent. de sacr. pœnit.pa.219

Quo igitur modo remittuntur (venialia) in purgatorio? varij sunt modi dicendi. Scotus dicit in instanti mortis, id est, in primo non esse hominis, propter merita quæ homo habuit in vita: Durandus dicit remitti quoad culpam in purgatorio, propter displicentiam quam habent illic animæ venialium, cum sint in charitate. Soto asseret remitti quoad culpam in purgatorio, propter actum charitatis & continuam patientiam, quam dum cruciantur, habent.

How then are veniall sinnes forgiuen in purgatorie? diuers holde diuersely. Scotus saith, they are forgiuen in the instant of death: that is, when man first beginneth not to be, by reason of his merites in his life time.

4 wonderful is the variety of popish doctrine.

Durand saieth, the faulte is remitted in purgatorie, for the displicence of venials, which the soules haue in that place: and that because they be in charity. Soto saieth, the sinne is remitted in purgatorie, for the act of charitie and continuall patience, which they haue in their torments. Whome will not this discordant theologie, vtterly disswade from papistrie.

The sixt Conclusion.

THe booke of Machabees, (which is the sole and onely foundation of popish purgatorie,) is of no force at al to establish the same. This conclusion shall be euidently prooued, when I shall effectuallye disproue the authority of the said booke of Machabees, wherewith many haue a long time beene most miserably seduced. Marke therefore my discourse herein.

To proue that the 2. book of Machabees, (out of which, praier and sacrifice for the dead, and consequently purgatorie is gathered,) is not Canonicall, that is, not penned by the assistance of the holy ghost, I say first, that it is not in the Canon of the Hebrewes, neither did the Iewes

or

or Hebrews at any time repute it, as a part of holy and diuine scripture. This S. Hierome witnesseth in these words:

Sicut ergo Iudith, & Tobiæ, & Machabæorum libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed inter Canonicas scripturas non recipit, sic & hæc duo volumina legit ad ædificationem plebis, non ad authoritatem Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandum. *Hier. in epist. ad Chromatium & Heliodorum de lib. Solomonis.*

As therfore the Church readeth the books of Iudith, and of Toby, and of the Machabees, but receiueth them not amongst the Canonical scriptures, so doth it reade also these 2. volumes for edification of the people, but not to confirme any Ecclesiastical doctrin. S. Cyprian hath the very same words in effect, in Symb. expositione.

S. *Augustine* doth testifie the same, when he thus writeth:

Hanc scripturam quæ appellatur Machabæorum, non habent Iudæi sicut legem, & prophetas, & Psalmos, quibus dominus testimonium perhibet tanquam testibus suis: dicens: oportebat impleri omnia, quæ scripta sunt in lege, & Prophetis, & in Psalmis de me. Sed recepto est ab Ecclesia non inutiliter, si sobriè legatur, vel audiatur: maximè, propter illos Machabæos, qui pro Dei lege sicut veri martires, à persecutoribus tam indigna atq; horrenda perpessi sunt. *Cyprian in expos. Symb. aug. contra 2. Gaudentii epist. lib 2. ca. 25, to. 7.*

This scripture which is of the Machabees, the Iewes repute not as they do the law, the Prophets and Psalmes, to which the Lord gaue testimony as to his witnesses, saying: It behoued all things to be fullfilled which are written in the law, in the Prophets, and Psalmess of me: but it is receiued of the Church not without profite, if it be reade or hearde soberly: especially, for those Machabees, who for the lawe of God as true martyrs, suffred for their persecuters so vnworthy and horrible tormentes. And their owne deare fryer Bryton telleth vs, that neither is it knowne who was the author of these bookes, neither did the east Church euer receiue them. I say secondly, that this second booke (out of which purgatorie is collected,) was neuer in Hebrewe: and consequently neuer authenticall among the Iewes. I say thirdly, that many thinges founde and affirmed in the bookes of Machabees, proue the same to be of no credit at all. For first, those for whome Iudas offred sacrifice & prayer, could not be holpen therwith: because as the text recordeth, they perished for their secret idolatry: and so saith the Glosse also: and consequently, Iudas erred grosly in praying and sacrificing for them, and the author of the book likewise in commending Iudas his fact. Whereupon it followeth necessarily, that the writer was not directed by the holy ghost: because hee concluded prayer *Bryto in prolo. Mach.*

for

for the dead vpon a notorious known fact condemned by the scriptures. Secondly, this booke saith, that the Iewes were led captiues into
2 Mac, 1, 19 Persia: but they were translated indeed, not into Persia but into Babylon, as their owne *Lyranus* doth testifie. Thirdly, the second booke
2 Mach. 1 saith that *Iudas* with others wrot their epistle to *Aristobolus* in the 188
1 Mach 9 yere, but the first booke affirmeth *Iudas* to be dead in the yere 152, so that he must perforce write his epistle 39 yeres after his death. Fourth-
2 Machab. 15 ly the first book saith, that Antiochus died in Babylon in his bed for sorrow: but the second Book auoucheth, that he was slaine in the tẽple of *Nannea*. Fiftly, because the author of the bookes of Machabes desireth pardon, if any thing be done amisse. These be his words: *Si*
2 Mac, 14, 37 *bene & vt historiæ competit, hoc et ipse velim: si autem minas digne, concedendum est mihi.* If I haue done wel and as is decent for the historie, that is my desire: but if not worthily, I must craue pardon. And doubtlesse, he that writeth by the direction of the Holy-ghost, needeth noe pardon at all. Sixtly, the wilfull murder of *Razias* is there commended, which commendation cannot proceed from the Holy-ghost. Seuenthly, the author of the Macchabees doth onely conclude praying for the
Titus 1, 12 dead, because *Iudas* offered sacrifice for the dead. Which generall, il-
1 Cor. 15, 33 lation vpõ a particuler fact, is not good in the Popish maner of proceeActs 17, 28. ding. For as their *Maxime* saith, which is true indeede:

Priuilegium paucorum, non facit legem communem.

The priuiledge of a few, cannot establish a general law: neither wil it help the papists to say, that saint *Augustine* and others alleaged this booke. For so saint *Paule* alleaged the testimonies of Ethnickes, Epimenides, Menander, and Aratus: and popish diuines alleage now and then Esops Fables.

But in what maner & to what end S. *Augustine* alleaged this booke, I haue shewed out of *Augustine* already. Neither yet will it help to say, (which some repute for a great argument) that this booke is in the corps of the Bible. For so is the fourth book of *Esdras* within the corps of the Bible, & yet do the papists themselues repute it, no better then a fable: yea, which is more to be noted: they will not haue the laste end of the Lords prayer, to be canonicall: albeit it bee founde in the greeke originall, and placed in the corpes of the Bible.

Arias Mont. in cap. 6. Mat. vers. 13 For the great popish linguist *Benedictus Arias Montanus*, telleth the reader in his obseruation vpõ that place, that it is not of the text thogh he cannot denie it, to be in the greeke & first originall.

To

To conclude, neither did Iudas pray himself, neither did he wil others to pray for remission of sinnes vnto the dead: neither is it flatly so said in the Greeke copie, neither did he offer sacrifice for the sinnes of the dead, but for the resurrection of the body, vnderstanding by sinne the death and corruption of the bodie, which proceedeth of sinne and followeth the same. Which my interpretation may bee gathered out of these words of the text it selfe: 2 Mac. 12, 43

Bene & religiose de resurrectione cogitans.

Thinking well and religiously of the dead.

And therefore is the illation of the Popish latine translation so highly commended and strictly commanded by the synod of Trent, vaine friuolous, and fooliſh. He that penned the storie, hath without al rime and reason inſarced the same: because no such conclusion can be truly gathered, of Iudas his oblation and fact.

THE COROLLARIE.

FIrst therefore, since there is no purgatory but Christs bloud.

Secondly, since after this life there is no place for merite or satisfaction.

Thirdly, since the Booke of Machabees is not Canonicall:

I conclude, that it is a sufficient Motiue for me to renounce the Romish Religion, as false, erroneous and pernitious doctrine.

Thus much of the sixt Motive.

The eyghth Chapter.

Of dissention among st the Papistes.

ALthough nothinge is more common with the Papistes, then to charge protestants with dissention: yet is it their owne peculiar badge, as will appeare by due examination thereof.

The first article of dissention.

THe first errection of the English seminarie at Rome, began with dissention, betweene the students one the one parte, and Mayster *Morice* the Welsh-man on the other part. This *Morice* was appointed the rectour of the seminarie, with whome tooke parte doctor Lewes an other Welsh-man (who was Arch-deacon to the Arch-bishop of Cambrey, and referendarie to the Pope at that time,) and also Cardinall *Morone* then the protector of the English nation.

With the ſcholers tooke part, the cloſe and politicke Ieſuites, who would ſeeme to doe nothing in the matter openly, but in deede did all in all ſecretly. For the ſpace of ſome dayes, (in which time the matter was hottely handled one both ſides, daily ſutes being made, and ſupplications exhibited vntō his holineſſe,) the Cardinall preuailed, and the Pope diſcharged the ſchollers. But the Ieſuytes labored ſo forcibly (and yet couertly:) that within three daies, (notwithſtanding all the means that the Cardinall did and coulde make,) the ſchollers were againe reſtored to their places. For Toledo the Ieſuite was commaunded by the generall of their ſocietie, to fall proſtrate on his knees before the Popes holineſſe, and there to make a pittifull lamentation for the ouerthrowe of Englande; that is forſooth, that now were reiected the fineſt wittes, the moſte towarde youthes, the ſeede of Poperie, and the onely hope of the Engliſhe nation: who now exiled for zeale in religion, and come to be his Popiſh vaſſals: muſte either be trained vp in papiſtrie after the Ieſuiticall manner, or els ſhould England neuer be reclaimed world without end.

This Toledo was pope gregories preacher, & adviſer in al important eccleſiaſtical cauſes.

Which ſweete narration, no ſooner ſounded in the Popes eares: but he commanded the ſchollers, to be receiued into the Colledge againe. And ſhortly after by Ieſuiticall pollicie, Maiſter *Morice* was *officiperda*, and a Ieſuite made rector in his place.

This diſſention ſtill continueth in that ſeminarie, as in which haue bene foure or fiue (to ſpeake of the leaſt,) notorious combats or endeauours betweene the rectour and the ſtudents: who ſhould expulſe each other. And ſometime the rectour hath ſo preuailed by pollicie, that ſome few haue bene diſmiſſed: and other-ſometime the generall of the Ieſuites hath bin glad to change the rector, ſo to appeaſe the diſſention.

The like agreement is, amongſt the papiſts at home here in england: for I pray you, did not their holy confeſſor M. Sherewood, euen in the time of his bondes for popetie, murder his Brother Papiſte in the tower of London? I wote he did. Did not old Sir Iohn in the kidcote at Yorke ſo agree with Comberforth the prieſt, that they would neuer keepe companie the one with the other: liuing both in one little priſon, and impriſoned for the ſelfe ſame cauſe? it was ſo, my ſelfe was *teſtis oculatus*. Did not Wright, Fletcher, and Comberforth impriſoned all together in the blocke-houſes at Kingſtone vpon Hull, agree

gree in deuiding their contributions which were right large ones, euen as theeues agree in deuiding their ſpoiles and robberies? Their mutual contumelies filled the eares of the countrey-papiſts, their writings were lamented of the readers.

Let *Padley*, *Norlees*, and *Hauerſiege* ſay, if it be not ſo.

What holy amitie is betweene the Ieſuite Muſh, and other ſeminarie prieſtes, *Brodell*, *Dakins*, *Butler*, and others his brother prieſtes will witneſſe with me.

And that ye may know in one word the perfection of the Engliſh Romiſh ſeminarie, you muſt vnderſtand, that by the Ieſuites their aduiſe, the ſtudents in their ſupplications to the Pope in their great conflict with the Cardinall, promiſed that they would all bee Romiſhe prieſts for the conuerſion of England to his Romiſh religion.

Which offer and promiſe was verie plauſible in the Popes eares.

For the better confirmation of which promiſe, all the ſchollers wer ſhortly called to their corporall othes.

All which was wrought and contriued, by the politikes the Ieſuits: ſome few ſchollers onely acquainted with the promiſe and oth, vntill the very inſtant in which they did ſweare.

Which oth as it was vngodlily made, ſo it is and will be vngodlily performed, ſo long as that colledge can ſtand, by all probabilitie.

I ſay by all probabilitie, becauſe I haue greate reaſon ſo to thinke: though I cannot as a God, diuine of future contingents.

That it is vngodlily performed, too much experience ſheweth by ſo manie ſeminaries ſent daily in multitudes, oddely and diſloyally into this land.

The like experience we haue in Iohn Gowre, who ſo long reſiſted the Ieſuites in refuſing to be made prieſt, and at length was made againſt his will for feare: as alſo in *Humfrey Maxfield* and *Thomas Newell*, very proper ſchollers for their time, who ſtaying in the ſeminary vntill they were vrged to be Prieſts, were at the laſt expulſed becauſe they would not be Prieſtes. But nowe to diſſentions of more importance.

The ſecond Article.

BEllarminus auoucheth, that it neither is, nor euer was lawfull ſince Chriſtes time, for Biſhops, Prieſtes, or Deacons, to marrye after taking of their orders: as which ſayeth he, is prohibited by the *Apoſtolique* law. *Bellar. lib. 1. de clericis cap. 19*

But their Canon law telleth vs another tale, for thus is it written in their owne decrees.

dist. 56. cap. cenomanensem

Cum ergo ex sacerdotibus nati in summos pontifices supra legantur esse promoti, non sunt intelligendi de fornicatione, sed de legitimis coniugijs nati: quæ sacerdotibus ante prohibitionem vbique licita erant, & in Orientali Ecclesia vsq; hodie eis licere probantur.

The mariage of Priests is very lawfull, as their own law confesseth

When therefore, we read that they are promoted to the popedome, who were the sonnes of Priestes: wee must not vnderstande that such were bastardes, but borne in lawefull wedlock and legitimate: which mariages were lawefull for Priestes euerie where before the prohibition: and in the easte Church they are approoued to be lawfull vntill this day.

And in another place of the said Canon-lawe wee are tolde of many popes that were priests sonnes: to wit, *Bonifacius, Agapitus, Theodorus, Sylverius, Fœlix, Deusdedit*, and others.

dist. 56. cap Osius.

The third article.

CONcerning veniall sinnes, howe they are remitted in purgatorie: the dissention is such and so great, as of the schole-men each one differeth from another.

Io. Aug. in 4 sent. de sacra. pœnit. p. 219.

Scotus saith, they are forgiuen in the instant of death: that is, when manne beginneth firste not to bee, by reason of his merites in his life time.

Durandus saith, they are forgiuen for the displicence of venials, which the soules haue in that place: and that because they are in charitie.

Soto sayeth, the sinne is remitted in purgatorie, for the acte of charitie, and continuall patience, which the soules haue in their tormentes.

The like dissention is about their pardons, as is said already.

The fourth article.

Nauar. cap 21 n. 34. in ench.

NAuarre telleth vs, that wee are onely bounde to confesse our mortall and greate sinnes, and that a Papiste comming vnto other Sacramentall confession, may confesse some, and conceale other some.

These are his words:

Hoc præceptum non includit venialia, etiam si mixta sint mortalibus. Quibus consequens est posse quem si velit, confesso vno peccato veniali alterum tacere.

This precepte doeth not include veniall sinnes, albeit they bee min-

mingled with mortals. Whereuppon it followeth, that the penitent may if he liſte, confeſſe one veniall and conceale another. Thus Nauarre, to which I adde: that by this doctrine, the penitent may diſſemble egregiouſly in confeſsion, and deceiue his ghoſtly father: and yet not ſinne at all.

But the famous popiſh Chancellour of Paris Iohannes Gerſonus, telleth another tale. Thus he writeth:

Omne peccatum pro quanto eſt offenſa Dei & contra legem eius æternam, eſt de ſuo condition & indignitate mortiferum, ſecundum rigorem iuſtitiæ, & a vita gloriæ ſeperativum. Ratio eſt, quoniam omnis offenſa in Deum, poteſt iuſtè ab ipſo iudice Deo puniri pœna mortis tam temporalis quàm æterna, imò annihilationis pœna. Eſt igitur de ſe mortifera, aſſumptum deducitur ex hoc, quod nulla pœna talis eſt ita mala, quàm mala eſt ipſa offenſa. Et ex alio: quia potius toleranda eſſet omnis mors pœnalis & annihilatio, quam committenda eſſet quantumlibet parua offenſa in deum: da oppoſitum, iam offenſa Dei licitè fieri deberet in caſu. Gerſ. de vita ſpirit. lect. 1 circa medium part. 3.

Euerie ſinne in that it is an offence againſt God and his eternall law, is mortal of it owne condition and dignity according to the rigour of iuſtice, and deuideth vs from the life of glorie. The reaſon is, becauſe God may iuſtly punniſh euery offenſe done againſt him, as well with eternall as temporall death, and with the mult of annihilation. It is therefore mortall of it owne nature.

The aſſumption is gathered of this, for that no ſuch punniſhment is ſo euill as the offenſe: as alſo euery penall death, and annihilation both: ought rather to be tolerated, then the leaſt ſinne to be committed: Grant the contrarie, and in ſome caſe ſinne ſhall be done lawfully, and be no ſinne at all.

Thus ſaith Gerſon, and this is a true, learned, and comfortable ſaying. Whereof more ſhall be ſaid hereafter.

The fift Article.

NAuarre ſaith, that one may both denie in word and vpon his oth, that which the iudge requireth of him: ſo hee equiuocate, and make his owne ſenſe vnto himſelfe: but their learned doctour Geneſius Sepulueda, telleth him it may not be ſo. Yet all our politikes, our Ieſuites I would ſay, holde with Nauarre. Yea, the Ieſuites will nowe and then by equiuocation, denye themſelues to bee Chriſtians: as their deare brother Iohn Muſhe confeſſeth, in his anſwere to my addition. *Nauar. in enchir. cap. 25. n. 61, cap. 25. n. 43*

dition: whose wordes I rehearsed at large, in my connterblast against him and his adherents.

The sixt Article.

ALL the Romish Iesuites and other papists now adaies auouch obstinately, that matrimonie is a sacrament, and conferreth grace *ex opere operato:* but their own Durandus and Gaufridus, affirme boldly the contrary.

Durand hath these expresse words:

Durand.in 4 sent.dist.26. quest.3

Præter duo prædicta, sunt alia duo circa matrimonium, circa quæ sine periculo hæresis, licitum, est contraria opinari: quorum vnum est theologicum, videlicet, vtrum in matrimonio conferatur gratia ex opere operato, sicut in alijs sacramentis novæ legis. Secundum est logicum, videlicet, vtrum matrimonium habeat plenam vnivocationem cum alijs sacramentis.

Besides these twoe, there be other two thinges to bee considered in matrimonie, wherein wee may without daunger of heresie thinke the contrary. The one is theological, to wit, if in matrimony be conferred grace *ex opere operato*, as in other sacraments of the new law. The other is logical, to wit, if matrimony be a sacrament properly and vnivocally so called. and Duraudus auoucheth Gaufridus with other Canonistes, to be of his opinion. So then matrimony neither giueth grace, nor yet is properly a sacrament.

THE SEAVENTH ARTICLE

of their dissention.

Sylvest.de papa num.10

SYlvester Prieras hath these wordes:

Papa est imperatore maior dignitate plus quàm aurum plumbo.

The Pope doth more excell the Emperor in dignitie then gold excelleth leade.

Againe he saith thus:

Donauit Constantinus papæ in venerationem & recognitionem Dominij, administrationem temporalem imperij, & eandem immediatè Papa concedit imperatori in vsum, & stipendium officij, pro gubernatione & defensione pacifica ecclesiæ.

The Emperour Constantine gaue the pope temporall administration of the Empire, in token of his reuerence & homage: and the pope gaue the Emperour the same againe, as the stipend of his seruice, for his peaceable protection of the church.

Sylvest.de papa num.14.

And a little after he hath these words:

Vnde dico, quod de plenitudine potestatis ex causa rationabili, potest omnes

leges

leges ciuiles euertere, & alias condere: niſi in quantum ſpectant ad ius naturale aut diuinum, nec imperator cum omnibus legibus & populis Chriſtianis poſſent contra eius voluntatem quicquam ſtatuere.

Whereupon I ſay, that the fulnes of power vpon reaſonable cauſe, the pope may diſſolue all the ciuill lawes, and make others: neither can the emperour with all lawes and conſent of Chriſtendome determine any one iot againſt his mind. The pope may make hauock of all chriſtendom euen at his pleaſure.

Archidiaconus and Auguſtinus de Ancona, are of the ſelfe ſame opinion with Sylueſter. But other papiſts are aſhamed now thus to holde: and therfore write ſharply againſt this opinion.

Bellarminus ſaith thus:

Chriſtus vt homo dum in terris vixit, non accepit, nec voluit vllum temporale dominium: ſummus autem Pontifex Chriſti vicarius eſt, & Chriſtum nobis repreſentat, qualis erat dum hîc inter homines viuerit. Igitur ſummus Pontifex vt Chriſti vicarius, atque adeo vt ſummus Pontifex eſt, nullum habet temporale dominium. Bellar. lib. 5 de Rom pont. c. 4. A.

Chriſt as man while hee liued on earth, neither had nor would haue any temporall dominion: but the pope is Chriſtes vicar, and repreſenteth Chriſt to vs, in ſuch ſort as hee liued here among men: therefore the Pope as Chriſts vicar, and conſequently as pope, hath no temporal dominion. Victoria hath theſe words:

Poteſtas temporalis non dependet a ſummo pontifice, ſicut aliæ poteſtates ſpirituales inferiores. Et paulo poſt: licèt aſſertores alterius partis communiter dicunt, quòd papa inſtituit omnem poteſtatem temporalem, tanquam delegatam & ſubordinatam ſibi, & quod ipſe conſtituit Conſtantinum imperatorem: ſed totum hoc eſt fictitium & ſine quacunque probabilitate, nec innititur vel ratione, vel teſtimonijs, vel ſcripturæ, vel ſaltem alicuius ex patribus, vel verè theologis, ſed gloſſatores iuris hoc dominium dederunt papæ, cũ ipſi eſſent pauperis rebus et doctrina. Victor de poteſt eccleſ. pag. 38

Temporall power doth not depend vpon the pope as inferiour ſpirituall powers doe: although others of the other parte commonly ſay, that the pope ordeined all temporall power, as delegate and ſubordinate to himſelfe, and that he made Conſtantine emperour. But all this is a meere fable, and void of all probability, neither hath it any ground, either of reaſon, or of ſcripture, or of ancient fathers, or good deuine: yet the gloſſers of the cannons gaue the pope this preheminence, becauſe themſelues were beggerly fellowes and vnlearned. Behold here the liuely originall of popedome, euen by the teſtimonie of the beſt learned popiſh doctor. Lo, ignorãce and pouertie are the aduãcers of popedome.

The

The eight article of Dissention.

THe papistes this day do constantly holde and teach, as a necessarie doctrine of faith: that there bee veniall sinnes which do not dissolue the amity betweene God and man; becausse they are not (saye they) *contra* but *præter legem dei.* Which distinctly *Thomas Aquinas* vttereth very plainly in these words:

Aquinas q. 88 ar. 3. ad. 1

Peccatum veniale dicitur peccatum secundum rationē imperfectam, & in ordine ad peccatū mortale, sicut accidens dicitur ens in ordine ad substantiam secūdum imperfectam rationem entis: non enim est contra legem. quia venialiter peccans nō facit quod lex prohibet, nec prætermittit id, ad quod lex per præceptum obligat, sed facit præter legem, quia non obseruat modum rationis quā lex intēdit

A venial sin is termed sin, after an vnperfect maner, & way to a mortal sin, euen as accidens is caled ens in order to substantia, after an vnperfect reason of ens. For it is not against the lawe: becausse hee that sinneth venially, doth not that which the law forbiddeth, neither doth omit that to which the law by precept doth oblige, but doth besides the law, becausse it doth not obserue the maner of reason which the law intendeth. But this opinion is sharpely reproved aud flatly confuted, by many learned papistes. For Michael *Baius apud Bellar. Ioannes Gerson de vita spirituali, lect. 1. circa med. and Roffensis artic. 32. cont. Luther,* affirme, that euery sin is mortall of it owne nature: and therefore may iustly be punished eternaly. *Durandus* proueth by many reasons, that euery sinne is against the lawe of God. *Ioannes Gerson & Almaine* hold the same. For thus speaketh *Ioseph. Angl.* of them.

Mich Baius apud Bellarm. de purg. l. 2. c 4

Apud Navar. prelud. 7, n. 16

Ios. Ang. in 2 d, 37, diff. 6

Tertia opinio est Gerso. & Almaini asserentium venialia & mortalia non differre ex natura rei, sed tantum ex divina misericordia, eo quòd placuit diuinæ maiestati imputare ad pœnam æternam mortale, veniale autem ad temporalem. vtrumque tamen ex natura sua, cum sit in Deum, esse dignum pœna æterna.

The third opinion is *Gersons* and *Almains,* affirming that veniall and mortal sinnes do not differ in the nature of the thing, but onely by the mercie of God: in that it pleased the maiestie of God, to assigne eternall paine for the one, and temporall for the other. For both of them deserue eternall paine of their owne nature, becausse they are againste God.

Gerson part. 3 de vita spirit. lect. 1

Idem Ioseph vbi sup. dif. 4.

And in another place the same *Iosephus* writeth in this manner.

Durandus tamen & alij permulti hanc sententiam impugnant, affirmantes peccata venialia esse contra mandata: & hæc opinio, videtur modo in scholis communior.

But

But Durand and many others impugne this opinion, auouching venial sins to be against the commandement: and this opinion nowe adaies, seemeth to be more common in the scholes: where note by the way out of the word (*modo* now adaies) the mutability of rom. religió. The popish doctrine is mutable. See the 1. c. & 4. concil.

The ninth article of Dissention.

THe councel of Trent, Thomas Aquinas, Bellarminus, and many other papists, affirme matrimonie to be properly a sacrament of the new testament, and to conferre grace.

But Durand denieth it, either to giue grace, or to be properly a sacrament. *Durand in 4. d 26. quest. 3*

So Alphonsus a Castro, and Petrus a Soto, deny it to bee properly a sacrament of the new law. *Apud Bellarm l. 1 de mat. c. 6*

And Melchior Canus, hauing sundrie others of his opinion, (as hee saieth) holdeth matrimony to be a sacrament, yet not euery matrimony to be so: but only that matrimony, which is celebrated *a ministro ecclesiastico sacris & solennibus verbis:* by the minister of the church the sacred and solemne words. *Canus de locis l. 8. c. 5. f. 246*

The like dissention is among papistes, about the matter and forme of the said sacrament. For Iosephus Angles reciteth fiue seuerall opinions for and concerning this one point of popish doctrine. *Ios. ang. in 4 s. de matri. ar. 4 diff. 1.*

And Melchior Canus beholdeth such variety in this matter, as he reputeth him a mad man, that wil beleue their sayings, whose words for better credit sake, are these:

Lege magistrum, D. Tho. Scotum, Bonav. Richard. Palud. Durand. cæteroſq; scholæ theologos. & nisi statim eorum pendentes ac vacillantes animos deprehenderis, tum vero me aut stultum, aut temerarium iudicato. Nam et cum quærunt an matrimonium conferat gratiam, id quod maxime eo loco finiendum erat, non definiunt tamen: sed in his referunt quæ in hominem opinione sunt posita. In materia item et forma huius sacramenti statuenda, adeo sunt inconstantes et varij, adeo incerti & ambigui, vt ineptus futurus sit, qui in tanta illorum varietate & discrepantia, rem aliquam certam, constantem, exploratam conetur efficere. *Canus de locis l. 8. c. 5. p 245*

Reade the master, S. Thomas Bonaventure, Richardus Paludanus, Durandus, and other schoole diuines: and if by and by thou doest not perceiue their wauering and doubtfull minds, then iudge me either a foole or a rash fellowe. For when they inquire if matrimonie conferre grace, that which was especially to be defined, that define they not at all, but onely tell what others thinke therein: and in determining the matter and forme of this sacrament, they are so vnconstant and vari-

ous, so vncertain and ambiguous: that he may be deemed a foole, who in such their variety and dissent, will establish any constant doctrine. Here gentle reader, thou maiest behold the dissention of papistes, euen in their sacraments and matters most important.

The tenth article of dissention.

Panormitanus, Abulensis, Gerson, Almaine, Cusanus, with all the fathers of the councell assembled at Constance, affirme euery generall councell to be aboue the pope, as I haue prooued in the 4. chapter and third conclusion: But all our Dominicanes, Iesuites, and Seminaries, do with open mouthes auouch the contrary, as their writings and experience this day teacheth vs.

Let not the Papists hence forth boast of their vnity.

The eleuenth Article of dissention.

The Iesuites and Seminaries tell vs, that the Church consisteth in those popes, who sit by materiall succession in Peters chaire at Rome: how bad soeuer their liues be, and how eronneous soeuer be their priuate opinions: but their owne great doctor Nich. Lyranus, doth sharply impugne that their sottish assertion: telling them that many popes haue forsaken the christian faith and become atheists, and therefore that the church doeth not consist in the materiall succession of men, but in the faith of Peter and doctrine which he preached.

Reade the place & mark the wordes, for they are most evident

Read his words in the third chapter, and fourth conclusion.

The like dissention is amongst papists, about the popes dispensation in *matrimonio rato non consummato*, as is already proued in the fifth chap. read and peruse the chapter.

The twelfth Article of dissention.

MAny Papistes, as Aquinas, Richardus, Paludanus, Marsilius, pope Gregory, and al his canonists do hold, that a simple priest by vertue, of the popes dispensation, may lawefully and effectually minister their sacrament of confirmation.

vide Bellar, & Ios, Ang, de sacram, confir,

Which opinion Couarruvias recordeth & iustifieth in these wordes:

Tertio probatur simplicem sacerdotem posse ex Rom. pontificis dispensatione, sacramentum hoc confirmationis ministrare, auctoritate D. Gregorij qui permittit & vere concedit licentiam presbyteris, vbi desunt Episcopi minist. audi sacramentum confirmationis: quod si fieri iure non posset, vir doctissimus & sanctissimus minime permisisset.

Couarr. tom. 2, l. 1. c. 10. p 24 De sac, confir,

It is proued thirdly, that a simple priest may vpon the popes graunt, administer this sacrament of confirmation by S. Gregories authority, who permitteth and indeed giueth license vnto priests where bishops want, to do the same.

But

But his opinion and practise is stoutly impugned by other great papistes, to wit, Bonauentura, Alphonsus. Durandus, Scotus, Maior and pope Hadrian, who all auouch that pope Gregory was a man and therfore might erre, and erred indeed egregiously; what greater and more important dissention can be then this? for confirmation is a sacrament with the papists. *vide Covarr. Iof. & bellarm. De sacr. confir.*

The thirteenth article of dissention.

ALbertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Ioannes Maior, Bonauentura Almain, Richardus, and other papists affirme, that euery of their 7 orders is a sacrament. Whereuppon I might infer right consequently, that the papists haue by iust number, 13. sacraments in all. *vide bellarm. & Iof. Ang*

But their Durand doth reiect this common opinion, as fooliſh and improbable. Yea, Victoria, Iosephus Angles, Caietanus, and Petrus Lombardus their maister of sentences, are no small patrons of Durandus his opinion.

Iosephus Angles writeth thus: *Ioſ. ang. de sacram. ord. ar, 2 diff. 3*

Non est erroneum affirmare cum Durando, solam ordinationem sacerdotis esse sacramentum ordinis, reliquas vero ordinationes sacramentalia esse, quia Ecclesia hactenus non declarauit oppositum, neque eius opinio scripturæ sacræ & sanctorum auctoritatibus contradicit.

It is not erroneous to affirme with Durand, that onely priesthood is a sacrament, and that the fixe other are meere sacramentals, because the church hitherto hath not declared the contrarie, neither is this opinion contrary to holy scripture, or to the doctrine of the fathers.

Victoria hath these wordes: *Victor. de potest eccles. pag. 90*

Si enim aliqui ordines non sunt iuris diuini vt certo constat de minoribus: non est dubitandum, quin collatio illorum committi possit non Episcopo.

For if some orders be not *de iure diuino*, as it is certain of the lesser orders: there is no doubt but the collation thereof may be committed to him that is no bishop.

And in another place the said Victoria saith thus: *Victor de sacra ord. p. 119*

Opinio Durandi & Caietani est probabilissima, scilicet quod solum sacerdotium est sacramentum, vel saltem quod quatuor minores nō sunt sacramentum.

The opinion of Durand and Caietane is most probable, to wit, that only priesthood is a sacrament, or at the least, that the foure lesser orders are not a sacrament. And a little after he telleth vs, that pope Vrbanus and Innocentius are of the same opinion.

These be his words:

Innocentius vir doctissimus, allegans Vrbanum papam dicit: Vrbanus ait quod solum presbyteratus & diaconatus sunt sacri ordines, & quod illi solum leguntur fuisse in primitiua Ecclesia.

victor. vbi sup

Innocentius a very learned pope affirmeth with pope Vrbane, that onely priesthood and deaconship are holie orders, and that they only were in the primitue Church.

The fourteenth article of dissention.

COvarruvias hauing alledged many writers touching the exemption of Clergie-men from secular iudgements, hath these words:

Quorum omnium ea est concors sententia, quod hæc clericorum exemptio sit omnino iuris diuini, cui per humanam legem derogari non possit.

Covarr. tom. 2, cap. 3. pract quæst.

Who all hold this opinion constantly, that this exemption of Clerks is wholy of the law diuine: frō which, mans law cannot derogate. Yet as saith the said Covarruvias in the same place, the contrary opinion is defended of many other papists: to wit, of Aquinas, Medina, Alciatus, Innocentius and others: so doubtful is their popish doctrine. The like dissention is about the conception of our Lady: for the pope and his Iesuites hold, that she was conceiued without sin, and therefore doe they celebrate the day of her conceptiō: but Aquinas (whose doctrin sundry popes haue confirmed) defendeth constantly the contrary opinion. And all Thomists take part with him, some few excepted.

Aquin. in 3, p. q. 27, ar. 2. ad. 3.

The fifteenth article of dissention.

IT is a constant position with the papistes, as which is lately defined by their councell of Trent, that no man knoweth himselfe to be in the fauor of God: & yet doth their religious bishop Amb. Catharinus, oppose himselfe with tooth and naile against the same: as appeareth euidently to such as list to reade them, by the bitter invectiue treatises between Dominicus Soto and him, concerning morall good acts. The Scotists hold, that we can keepe al the commandements, *quoad substantiam operis:* the Thomistes say, we can do some, but not all: their greate schooleman Gregorius holdes, that we can do none at all.

The sixteenth article of dissention.

THat the Emperour Constantine was baptised at Reme by Sylvester then bishop there, is constantly affirmed by Damasus, Nicholaus, Clemens, Thomas, Platina, Marianus, Sabellicus: yea, Nicephorus auoucheth it to bee so certaine, as euery one may thinke it, and securely beleeue it: yet is this opinion sharply impugned, by many others with them deemed papistes: Hieronymus, Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoritus, Zozomenus, Cassiodorus, and Pomponius.

vide Canum de locis lib. 11 cap. 5, p. 320

Argumentum ad hominum.

The seauenteenth article of dissension

THe Pope and his Iesuites tell vs, that in the eucharist, the substance of bread is transsubstantiated into the bodie of Christe, so as accidents remaine there without their subiectes: but my L. Abbot their *Rupertus* saith, that Christ is personally bread in hypostaticall vnion by force of consecration, euen as hee is personallye man by incarnation. *apud Bellar. li 3 de euch. cap. 11*

The eighteenth article of dissention.

The pope and his Cardinals with the troups of Iesuits, tel vs, that priuate Masse is lawfull, and that the priest may deuoure vp all himselfe: but apostolical canons appoint al to communicate, or els to be driuen out of the congregation: and pope *Calixtus* affirmeth the very same. *De consecr. dist secunda, cap peracta. d. c. omnes, & can, 10. apostoloru*

The ninteenth article of dissention.

Popish dissention touching the production of a substance, out of the accidents which Papistes imagine, to remaine without subiects in the eucharist: is incredible. *Innocentius* holdeth one opinion: *Aquinas* two, the one repugnant to the other: *Richardus* another, *Caietaine* another, *Scotus* another. *Ioſ. Ang. in 4 art. vlt de accid. euchar.*

The twentieth article of dissention.

The Church of Rome teacheth it to be a matter of faith, to beleeue Christs body to be in euery part, when one of their consecrated hosts is broken in many peeces: but their schoole-doctour *Iohannes* Maior, saith it is a probleme. *Ioſ. Ang. in 4. ſ. q. 1 de euch. 7. diff.*

the 21. article of Dissention.

Touching the quantitie of bread and wine, how much may be consecrated at one masse: there are three opinions amongest the Papistes. *Bonauentura* holdeth one opinion, *Caietayne* another, and the thirde is the common. *Ioſ. ang. in 4. ſ. de euchar. 5. diff. q. 1.*

the 22. article of Dissention.

COncerning the bred to be consecrated: *Albertus magnus* holdeth, that either wheat or barley bread will suffice. *Caietaine* saith, any breade whatsoeuer is vsed to bee eaten in any countrey, may bee the bread of consecration. *Ioſ. Ang. in 4. de euchar. ar. 3*

The third opinion holdeth, that onely bread of wheat can suffice.

the 23. Article of Dissention.

Confirmation with the Papists is a sacrament, and therefore can it not be omitted without sinne, as *Richardus*, *Durandus*, and *Sylvester* affirme: yet doe *Aquinas* and pope *Adrian*, defend the contrary. *Adrianus q. de confir. ar. 1.*

The 24. article of Diſſention.

Ioannes Pariſienſis affirmeth the ſubſtance of bread, to be united to the body of Chriſt hipoſtatically: *Durand* holdeth that the ſubſtance of bread is deſtroyed, but the matter of bread abideth ſtil with chriſts bodie. Cardinall *Caietain* ſaith, that nothing in the Goſpel enforceth vs to vnderſtand thoſe words, (this is my bodie,) ſo groſſely and carnally as the Papiſtes doe. The counſell of Trent auoucheth, that the bread neither is annihilated, neither abideth it ſtil in the ſacramente: *quod qui poteſt capere, capiat*, for if it neither abide in the ſacrament, neither is annihilated, that is, become nothing: I would know what it is, and where it abideth.

Aquin. in 3, p. q. 65, ar, 4 apud Ioſ. Ang. in 4, ſent. de converſ. p. 166

The 25. article of diſſention.

Quinas and *Caietanus* affirme, that the quantity of a popiſh conſecrate hoſt, may be corrupted naturally, *Scotus* ſaith, that is impoſſible to euerie naturall agent: *Ioſephus Angles* holdeth, that a naturall agent may corrupt the whole quantitie by deuiſion of the parts therof: but neither by way of condenſation, neither by tranſmutation into another forme: and that forſooth, becauſe the quantity of Popiſh ſacrament, is there without a ſubiect: which ſubiect is the ordinarie obiect of euerie naturall agent.

Ioſ. Ang. in 4, ſ. de accident, euchar, p. 172,

The 26. article of Diſſention.

Concerning conſecration of the chalice (as the papiſts terme it) *Aquinas* holdeth, that all the words ſet downe in the Romiſh miſſall, are of the eſſence of the forme. *Alexander Alenſis*, *Bonauentura*, and *Durandus* affirme, that more then the one halfe of the ſaide wordes, are meere extrinſecall and not of the effence thereof. *Scotus* ſaith, that the forme is not certainly knowen vnto the Church of Rome: and therfore none can be ſecure, but he that pronounceth all the words. *Soto* auoucheth, that if the prieſt haue intention to conſecrate by the former words, (which *Bonauenture* *Alenſis*, and *Durand* teach to be the form) then the ſaid Prieſt conſecrateth, but committeth thereby ſacriledge: becauſe forſooth, ſaith *Soto*, peraduenture the other opinion is true. And Ioſephus exorteth very grauely, to haue intention, neither to cõſecrate preciſely by the former wordes, nor yet by the latter, but to haue the intention of the Church, (iumpe with the colier:) for in ſo doing ſaith he, the ſacrificer ſhall be in no daunger.

Ioſ. ang. in 4 ſ. euchar. p. 104

Now I beſeech thee gentle Reader, what horſe would not breake his halter to heare this melodie.

The 27. article of Diſſention.

CONcerning the formation of Eve, wonderfull are the exclamations of *Catharinus* against *Caietanus*, and of *Antonius Fonseca* against *Catharinus*: as also of *Paulus Burgensis* against *Lyranus*, and of *Mathias Thoring* against *Burgensis* in many other things peruse their glosses vpon the old and new testament, and all this will appeare.

The 28. article of dissention.

IT is a great questiō amongst the Papists, what that is which a mouse eateth, when she catcheth their reserued host. *Bonauentura*, & theyr maister of sentences affirme, that the mouse eateth not Christes body: but our Popes, Cardinals, and *Iesuits* defend the contrary, as a grounded article for their beleefe. *Lombard & bonavent. in 4 sent. dist. 13*

The 29. article of dissention.

Pope *Adrian*, *Richardus*, and *Panormitanus* tel vs, that a priest being contrite, may say masse, before he be confessed: but by the decree of our counsell of Trent, this fact is a damnable sinne. *Ios. Ang. in 4 sent. pag. 117.*

The 30. article of dissention.

Our Pope, Cardinals, and Iesuits tell vs, that infidels are not bounden to their auricular confession: But *Richardus*, *Gabriel*, and *Angelus*, defend the contrary. *Ios. Ang. in 4. sent. ar. 2 de confes.*

the 31. Article of Dissention.

Bellarminus auoucheth, that mo voices in counsels must needs be of force: but *Canus* affirmeth, that the lesser part is the best, if the Pope hold with the same. And yet in this point notwithstanding their good agreement resteth the foundation of their Popish religion. Read theyr words in the 4 chap.

the 32. article of Dissention.

THe counsel of *Lateran*, (where were present 284 persons, patriarks, metropolitanes, Bishops, and abbots) defined absolutely, that angels were created at one and the selfe same time with the world: and yet *Basilius*, *Nazianzenus*, *Damascenus*, *Hyeronimus*, *Augustinus*, and *Aquinas*, deny the same to bea matter of faith. *Concil. Later. can. 1 de fide cathol.* *Canus de locis lib. 5. pa. 169*

Many other like dissentions I could easilie alledge, as of Cardinall *Caietans* dissention about diuorce and such like. But because mine entent is to be briefe, these for this time may suffice.

For if I should touch all dissentions amongest the Papistes, the day would sooner faile me, then matter whereof to speake.

THE COROLLARIE.

First therefore, since the Papists are at bloudy conflict, concerning the Popes civill regiment. Secondly, since they teach venial sins

not

not to dissolue amitie betweene God and man, their greatest doctors impugning the same. Thirdly, since some of them constantly affirme matrimonie to be a sacrament: and other some deny the same with tooth and naile. Fourthly, since to hold the Pope to be aboue the generall councel, is with some no article of faith nor error at all, with other some an error in faith, and flat heresie. Fiftly, since some papistes maintaine Romishe doctrine by materiall succession, and other some bitterly exclaime against the same. Sixtly, since some do affirme, that the Pope may dispense for the ministrie of confirmation: and other some that it is a heynous crime. Seaventhly, since some hold, that euery of their orders is a sacrament, and some zealouslie impugne the same. Eightly, since many papists defend our ladies conception without sin: and many other avouch it to haue bin sin. Ninthly, since it is constant doctrine amonge the Papistes, that Constantine was baptized at Rome, and that notwithstanding ancient fathers with vniforme consent, repute the same a fable: Tenthly, since those and manye other important dissentions be amongst the Papistes:

I conclude, that it is a sufficient Motiue for me to renounce the Romish Religion, as false, erroneous and pernitious doctrine.

Thus much of the seauenth Motive.

The ninth Chapter.

Of credite due vnto writers.

THe Papistes exclaime against protestants, because they reiect now and then the authoritie of man.

For whose better satisfaction in that behalfe, if they will bee satysfied with reason: these conclusions may suffice.

The 1. Conclusion.

THe protestants speaking of the wiser and discreeter sort, do highly reuerence the holy fathers and ancient writers, dilligently reade their works, and gladly vse them as good helps and ordinary meanes vnder God: for & concerning the exact explication of holy writ. Of this conclusion none can be ignorant or stand in doubt thereof, that seriously peruse D. Iewell, the famous and worthy Bishop of Salisbury against D. Harding: D. Whitgift, the most reuerend, learned, and vertuous archbishop of Canterbury, against M. Cartwright: D. Cooper the reuerend bishop of winch. against the Martinists: D. Reinolds, D. *Srauia* Doctor *Sutline*, and others.

The 2. Concluſion.

THe Proteſtants, although they ſpeake and thinke reuerently of the ancient fathers: yet do they neither repute their works of equal authority with the holy ſcriptures: neither to be free from all errours and imperfections: wherein they nothing at all ſwerue from that modeſt eſtimation, which the ſaid holy fathers had euer of themſelues.

For proofe of this concluſion, S. Auguſtine writeth in this manner.

Ego ſolis eis ſcripturarum libris qui iam canonici appellantur, hunc timorem & honorem didici deferre, vt nullum eorum auctorem ſcribendo aliquid erraſſe firmiſſime credam: alios autem ita lego, vt quantalibet ſanctitate doctrinaq; præpolleant, non ideo verum putem quia ipſi ita cenſuerunt, ſed quia mihi vel per illos auctores canonicos, vel probabili ratione quod a veritate non abhorreat, perſuadere potuerunt. Aug. epiſt. 19 ad Hiero.

I haue learned to giue this feare and honour to thoſe onely bookes of ſcripture, which are called canonicall, that I firmly beleeue no author therof to hau erred in any point: but yet I read others ſo, that how holy or learned ſoeuer they be, I doe not by and by thinke it true becauſe they ſay ſo: but becauſe they perſwade me by thoſe canonicall writers, or by probable reaſon, that that is true they ſay.

And in another place the ſame S. Auguſtine hath theſe words:

Ego huius epiſtolæ authoritate non teneor, quòd literas Cypriani vt canonicas non habeo, ſed eas ex canonicis conſidero, & quod in eis diuinarum ſcripturarum auctoritati congruit, cum laude eius accipio: quod autem non congruit, cum pace eius reſpuo. Aug. contra Creſconium l. 2, c. 32

I am not bounde to the authority of this epiſtle, becauſe I take not Ciprian his writings for canonicall, but conſider them by the canonical, and what I find in them agreable to holy writ, that with his praiſe do I receiue: but what is diſſonant, that with his fauor I reiect.

And againe hee ſaith of himſelfe in this manner:

Negare non poſſum nec debeo, ſicut in ipſis maioribus ita multa eſſe in tam multis opuſculis meis, quæ poſſint iuſto iudicio & nulla temeritate culpari. Habetur diſt. 9. c. negare 4

I neither can nor dare deny, but as in our anceſtors, ſo in my works alſo are many thinges, which may iuſtly, and without all temeritie be reprooued. Yea the ſame Sainte Auguſtine oppoſeth onely Sainte Pauls teſtimonie againſt all the writers Saint Hieronie could alledge, about the great controuerſie, where ſaint Peter was reproued of ſaint Paul. By which teſtimonie it is very plaine that S. Auguſtine did reuerence the olde writers, but yet did think them men, and to haue their Aug. epiſt. 19 ad hier. tom. 2, pag. 50

errors: and therefore would he not admit for truth whatsoeuer they wrote, but only that he found to be consonant to the holy scriptures. And because my L. of Roch. is so highly renowned in the Church of Rome, he shall make an ende of this conclusion, where hee writeth in this manner: *Nec Augustini, nec Hieronomi, nec alterius cuiuslibet auctoris doctrinæ se ecclesia subscripsit, quin ipsi locis aliquot ab iis liceat dissentire. nam in nonnullis ipsi locis se plane monstrarunt homines esse, atq; nonnunquam aberrasse sequitur. quo sit, vt tametsi propter aliquas humanas hallucinationes, de multis (quæ dicti patres in commentarijs suis reliquerunt) dubitare liceat: sanctitatem tamen eorum haud licet in dubium revocare.*

Roff. art. 32 aduers. Luther pa. 420

The church (of Rome) hath not so subscribed to the doctrin either of *Augustine* or of Hierom, or of any other writer: but that wee may dissent from their opinions in some places. For themselues haue in certain places shewed plainly that they were men, and wanted not their errors. Wherfore albeit by reason of humain frailtie we may lawfullie doubt of many things which the said fathers haue left behind them in their bookes: yet may we not now call their holinesse into question. In which words, our great Popish Bish. teacheth vs 3. documents.

First, that their church giueth every one libertie; to dissent from Augustine, Hierom, and others writers whatsoever.

Secondly, that the Fathers haue plainlie declared themselues to be men, and to haue had their imperfections accordinglie.

Thirdlie, that many errors are to be found in the commentaries of the Fathers. So then our bishop is of mine opinion, and so also shuld the rest be: if they would be constant in their owne doctrine, which is published to the view of the world.

The 3. Conclvsion.

NOt that which the greater part of the fathers or mo voices agree vnto, is alwaies the vndoubted truth: but oftentimes that which the lesser part and fewer persons doe affirme.

For the prose hereof, Melchior Canus writeth thus:

Canus de locis l. 5. c. 5. p. 164.

Scimus frequenter vsu venire, vt maior pars vincat meliorem scimus non ea semper esse optima, quæ placent pluribus: scimus in rebus quæ ad doctrinam pertinent, sapientum sensum esse præferendum: & sapientes sunt paucissimi, cum stultorum infinitus sit numerus.

We knowe it often chanceth so, that the greater part preuaileth against the better. We know that those thinges are not euer the beste, which please the most. We know that in matters of doctrin, the iudgment

ment of the wise ought to be followed: for wise men bee fewe, and fooles infinit. *Iosephus Angles*, *Thomas Aquinas*, and *Petrus Lombar.* affirme it to be the opinion of the old fathers, of Basilius, of Ambrosius, of *Chrisostomus*, of *Hieronimus*, of *Eusebius*, of *Damascenus*, of *Gregorius*, and of others, that the world was created in sixe naturall dayes succesiuely, as Moyses recordeth the same: yet this notwithstanding saint Augustin holdeth opinion against them all, and sayth, that the 6. daies mentioned by Moyses were metaphoricall, not natural. *Moyses* deuiding those things which were made by parts for the better capacity of the rude and ignorant people to whom he spake. Whose opinion of one only *Augustine*, was euer preferred in the church, as testifieth *Melchior Canus* in these words:

Ioſ. Ang. de creat. rerum diſt. 12. q. 1

Aquin. 1. p. qu 74. ar. 2. in cor p Lombard. 12 diſt. 12

At communis hic sanctorem consensus nullum argumentum certum theologis submministrat, quin vnus Aug. opinio cateris omnibus aduersa, probabilis semper in ecclesia est habita.

Canus de locis, l. 7. c. 1. p. 116

But this common consent of the holy Fathers doth not yeilde anye sound argument to divines, for the opinion of one only Augustine repugnant to the rest, was ever thought probable in the church.

Canus vbi supra pag. 217

All the old writers, *Augustinus*, *Ambros. Chrysost. Remigius*, *Euseb. Maximus*, *Beda*, *Anselmus*, *Bernardus*, *Erhardus*, *Bernardinus*, *Bonauentura*, *Thomas*, *Hugo*, and all the reste of them without anye exception, affirme vniformelie citing expresse texts of scripture for their opinion, that the blessed virgin Mary was conceiued in originall sinne: and yet doth the late hatched neast of Iesuites, and sundry other Papists auouch this day the contrary for the truth. Therefore sayth their owne archbish. and great Canonist *Panormitanus*, that we ought at al times to giue more credit to one onely prelate whosoeuer alledging the scriptures, then to the resolution of the Pope himselfe, or of his councell, not grounded vpon the saide scriptures.

Panormit. apud Sylvest. de conc. par. 3.

The 4. Conclusion.

THe Papists themselues do often reiect the generall and common opinion, and follow their owne priuate iudgements, neuer remembring, or little regarding, that they condemne the like in others.

Thus writeth their owne Melchior Canus:

Vbi ego si Thomistæ omnes cum Scotistis existant, si cum antiquis iuniores vellent contra me pugnare, tamen superior sim necesse est. non enim vt nonnulli putant, omnia sunt in Theologorum auctoritate.

Canus de locis l. 8. c. 5. p. 245

Wherein, though all the Thomists stand with the Scotistes, though

the old writers with the yong fight againſt me, yet ſhall I of neceſſity haue the vper hãd ouer them. For al things reſt not as ſome do think, in the authoritie of diuines. Their owne Cardinall *Caietain*, notwithſtanding his zealous affection towards popery and his own popiſh eſtate, did for all that freely acknowledge the truth in this point: in ſo much that he preferreth a ſenſe newly perceiued, but grounded vpon the ſcriptures before the old receiued opiniõ of how many fathers ſo ever. whoſe words becauſe they are worthy the hearing and reading I will alledge at large. Thus doth he write. *Super quinque libris Moſis iuxta ſenſũ literalem novumq; ſcripturæ ſenſum quandoque illaturus ſub ſ. matris eccleſiæ ac apoſtolicæ ſedis cenſura, rogo lectores omnes ne precipites deteſtentur aliquid, ſed librent omnia apud ſacram ſcripturam, apud fidei chriſtianæ veritatem, apud Catholicæ eccleſiæ documenta ac mores. & ſi quando occurrerit novus ſenſus textui conſonus, nec à ſacra ſcriptura, nec ab eccleſiæ doctrina diſſonus, quamvis à torrente doctorum ſacrorum alienus, æquos ſe præbeant cenſores. meminerint ius ſuum vni cuiq; tribuere, ſolis ſcripturæ ſacræ authoribus reſeruata eſt authoritas hæc, vt ideo credamus ſic eſſe quod ipſi ita ſcripſerunt. nullus itaque deteſtetur novum ſacræ ſcripturæ ſenſum, ex hoc quod diſſonat à priſcis doctoribus. ſed ſcrutetur per ſpicacius textum ac contextum ſcripturæ, & ſi quadrare invenerit, laudet deum, qui non alligavit expoſitionem ſcripturarum ſacrarum priſcorum doctorum ſenſibus, ſed ſcripturæ ipſi integræ ſub catholicæ eccleſiæ cenſura. alioquin ſpes nobis ac poſteris tolleretur exponendi ſcripturam ſacram, niſi transferrendo (vt aiunt) de libro in quinternum.*

Caietan. in ſua prefat. in 5. libros Moſaicos

Being nowe ready to write vppon the pentateuch of Moſes according to the literall ſenſe, and purpoſing to bring now and then a new ſenſe of the ſcripture, vnder the cenſure of our holy mother the church and apoſtolike ſeate: I deſire all that ſhall read my commentaries, to contemne nothing raſhly, but to ponder euery thing with the ſcripture and the verity of the Chriſtian faith, and the doctrine of the Catholike church. And if at any time a new ſenſe occurre, which is conſonant to the text, and not diſſonant from holy writ and doctrine of the church, although it ſwarue from the opinion of neuer ſo many fathers: yet let the readers iudge thereof indifferently, and according to equity. Let them remember to giue euery one his right: for this priuiledge is onely granted to the writers of the holy ſcriptures: that wee muſt therefore beleeue it to be ſo, becauſe they haue written ſo. Let none therfore loath a new ſenſe of holy ſcripture, becauſe it diſſenteth from the old doctors; but let him exactly conſider the text and context

of

of the ſcripture: and if he finde it to agree, let him praiſe God, whoe hath not tyed the expoſition of the holy ſcriptures, to the opinions of the old doctors, but to the integritie of the ſcripture it ſelfe, vnder the cenſure of the catholike church. For otherwiſe neither we nor our poſteritie ſhould haue any hope to expound the ſcripture, but onely to tranſlate out of one booke into another.

Thus we heare the verdict of our *Caietain*, our *Thomiſt*, our frier, our Cardinall of Rome: by whoſe reſolution it is evident, that noe ſence, though neuer ſo new, no expoſition though neuer ſo ſtrange, no opinion though different from neuer ſo many fathers, ought to be reiected if it be agreeable to the ſcriptures: and conſequently, it followeth by the ſaid reſolution, that euery truth is to be tried by the ſcriptures and none by the fathers.

Loe, popiſh doctrine is confuted, by the beſt learned Cardinal that euer was at Rome.

For firſt, our Cardinall telleth vs, that he purpoſeth now & then, to bring new ſenſes, new gloſſes, new expoſitions of the ſcriptures.

Secondly, he ſaith, that ſuch new ſences muſt not raſhly be contemned, but duly examined by the ſcriptures: and then admitted, if they be found conſonant to the ſame.

Thirdly, he teacheth vs the golden leſſon, that God hath not tyed the expoſition of the ſcripture, to the iudgement of any auncient father or fathers whoſoeuer.

Fourthly, he telleth vs, that the Apoſtles and ſuch as onely penned the holy ſcriptures, had this ſpecially prerogatiue, that they could not erre. All which important pointes, are ſo learnedly, ſo grauely, and ſo chriſtianly obſerued by this Cardinal, as more cannot be wiſhed: yea, in the ſelfe ſame preface he profeſſeth conſtantly, that he will neyther expound the Greeke nor the Latine text: but the fountaine and the originall, to wit, the Hebrew. And his reaſon is, becauſe the Hebrew onely is authenticall. *Caiet. vbi ſup.*

Where note by the way, that the Latine edition which the Papiſts tearme *vulgata*, and which is ſo magnified by the late counſel of trent, as both the Greeke and the Hebrew muſt giue place vnto the ſame: is of ſmall or no authority in reſpect of the Hebrew, by Cardinall *Caietanus* his reſolution.

Note ſecondly, that this Cardinal did dedicate theſe his commentaries, (in which all theſe memorable obſeruations are conteined) to our holy father Pope *Clemment* himſelf, who peruſed them and diſſalowed

no parte thereof: and conſequently, that this doctrine of Caietane is confirmed by the pope. For ſo mightily hath God alwaies wrought for the truth of his goſpel, as euident teſtimonies are ſet down euen by the aduerſaries, and remaine this day with them vncancelled for confirmation of the ſame. Neither is this the opinion of the popes cardinal only, but of Aquinas alſo his angelicall and beſt approued doctour.

His words I wil likewiſe alledge at large, becauſe, albeit they belong yet cā they not be thought tedious to ſuch as loue the truth: as which are moſt ſignificant and effectuall for the controuerſie nowe in hand.

Thus therefore doth he write:

Aquin. p. 1. q 1. ar. 8. ad 2. argumentum.

Licet locus ab auctoritate quæ fundatur ſuper oratione humana, ſit infirmiſſimus: locus tamen ab auctoritate quæ fundatur ſuper reuelatione diuina: eſt efficaciſſimus. Vtitur tamen ſacra doctrina etiam ratione humana, non quidem ad probandum fidem (quia per hoc tolleretur meritum fidei,) ſed ad manifeſtandum aliqua alia quæ traduntur in hac doctrina. Cum igitur gratia non tollat naturam ſed perficiat, oportet quod naturalis ratio ſub ſerviat fidei, ſicut & naturalis inclinatio voluntatis obſequitur charitati. Vnde & Apoſtolus dicit 2. Corinth. 10. in captiuitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obſequium Chriſti. Et inde eſt, quod & authoritatibus philoſophorum ſacra doctrina vtitur, vbi per rationem naturalem veritatem cognoſcere potuerunt: ſicut Paulus act. 17. inducit verbum Arati, dicens: ſicut & quidam poetarum veſtrorum dixerunt, genus dei ſumus: ſed tamen ſacra doctrina huiuſmodi auctoritatibus vtitur, quaſi extraneis argumentis & probabilibus. Auctoritatibus autem canonicæ ſcripturæ vtitur, propriè ex neceſſitate argumentando. Auctoritatibus autem aliorū doctorum eccleſiæ, quaſi arguendo ex propriis, ſed probabiliter: innititur enim fides noſtra reuelationi apoſtolis & prophetis factæ, qui canonicos libros ſcripſerunt, non autem reuelationi, ſi qua fuit aliis doctoribus facta.

Although the place of authoritie, which is grounded vpon mannes reaſon, be moſt weake and infirme: yet the place which is grounded vpon diuine authority, is moſt ſure and effectuall: neuertheles, ſacred doctrine vſeth alſo mans reaſon, not indeed to eſtabliſh faith, (for ſo faith ſhould looſe it merite,) but for the manifeſtation of ſome other things which are deliuered in this doctrine.

Sinçe therfore grace doth not deſtroy nature, but doth perfect the ſame, it is expedient that naturall reaſon bee ſeruant vnto faith, euen as naturall inclination of the will is ſeruant vnto charity: whereupon the apoſtle willeth vs, to bring our vnderſtanding captiue to the obedience of Chriſt. And from hence commeth it, that ſacred doctrine

vſeth

vseth also the authorities of philosophers, when they could by natural reason haue knowledge of the truth, as saint Paul alledged the saying of Aratus: yet sacred doctrin vseth such authorities, as argumẽts which are external, and only probable. But vseth the authorities of canonical scripture, as arguments that are proper, and which conclude of necessity: as for authorities of the doctours of the church, it vseth them as proper argumẽts: but which are onely probable, and do not conclude necessarily. For our faith is grounded vpon reuelation made to the apostles and prophets, who wrote the canonical scripture: but not vppon reuelatiõ of any other writers, if any were made vnto them. Thus saith Aquinas. Out of whose words I gather first, that the authority brought from man, is euer insufficient.

I gather secondly, that that ground whereuppon we must build, as vppon an vndoubted trueth, is onely and solely the authority of the scriptures.

I gather thirdly, that mans reason may neuer be vsed, to establish any point of doctrine.

I gather fourthly, that the fathers are to be read reuerẽtly, and their authorities to be vsed as probable reasons, but not as necessary demõstrations.

I gather fiftly, that fained romish reuelations are not authenticall. And consequently, that all reuelations diuulged vnder the name of S. Bridget and others, are either meere illusions, or of small force, and which can yeild no sound argument in matters of faith.

Victoria in very briefe words, vttereth this point effectually. *Victoria de sacram. p. 118*

Licet in hoc omnes conueniant, non est tamen mihi certum.

Although (saith he) all agree in this, yet do not I make it certaine.

Nauarre singeth the same song in many places, whereof I will recite onely one. *Navar. in enchir. cap. 7. paral. 4*

Tum quod fundamentum principale ipsius est, quod communis tenet oppositũ, quod ipsum etiam ipse assero; sed non obstat, quia a communi recedendum, quum pro contraria est textus vel ratio cui non potest satis bene responderi.

Because also his principall ground is, that the common opinion is to the contrary: which thing I my selfe also grant. But that is not of force: for we must renounce the common opinion, when there is either text or reason which cannot be sufficiently answered.

In fine, their owne glosse in their decrees reiecteth saint Augustine roundly in these wordes:

Cum

7.q.1.c nupt *Cum enim salua sua pace, Augustinus non bene opponit istis, & ita dormitauit hic Augustinus.*

Where saint Augustine by his fauour doeth not well obiect against this: and so *Augustine* here was a sleepe.

Loe, when the fathers speak not placentia, euery beggerly popish glosse reiecteth them at pleasure. *And* yet must we vnder paine of excommunication admit their authority, when they seeme to make for poperie: albeit, they speake neuer so flatly against the holy scriptures. Yea their late councell of Lateran chargeth all preachers vnder paine of excommunication, that they expounde the scriptures according to the old doctors, receiued in the church of Rome.

conc. Latera. 2 sess. penult.

THE COROLLARIE.

First therefore, since the auncient fathers may erre, and haue also erred *de facto*.

Secondly, since saint *Augustine* admitteth the opinion of Fathers, no further then they agree with the Scriptures.

Thirdly, since that which is holden of the greater parte of the Fathers is often false and disagreeable to the truth.

Fourthly, since the Papists themselues preferre the opinion of one before many.

Fiftly, since Caietanus, Canus, Navarrus, and others, do all roundly reiect the common opinion, when it disliketh them:

Sixtly, since their owne glosse maketh no account of S. *Augustine*, when he speaketh not *placentia*:

I conclude, that it is a sufficient Motiue for me to renounce the Romish Religion, as false, erroneous and pernitious doctrine.

Thus much of the eight Motive.

The tenth Chapter.

Of Traditions written and vnwritten.

THe Papists beare the world in hand, that many things necessary for mans saluation, are not conteined in the written worde: and consequently, that none can be saued, but such as beleeue their vnwritten traditions.

Wherein that truth may plainly shew it selfe, after mine accustomed manner, I put downe conclusions.

The

The first Conclusyon.

THe written worde or holye scripture, conteineth in it selfe everie thing necessary for our saluation.

For proofe of this conclusion, saint Paule writeth vnto Tymothy in this manner:

Quia ab infantia sacras literas nostri, quæ te possunt instruere ad salutem per fidem in Christo Iesu. 2 Tim. 3, 16

Because thou hast knowne the Scriptures from thy infancy, which are able to instruct thee to saluation, through faith in Christ Iesus.

Now if the scriptures be able so to instruct one, as he may thereby attaine his saluation: it cannot doubtlesse be demed with reason, that euerie thing necessarie for mans saluation is conteined therein.

For which cause the Apostle addeth these words:

Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἵνα ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος. Cap. eod. vers. 16

The whole scripture is giuen by the inspiration of God: and is profitable to doctrin, to redargution, to correction, to instruction, which is in righteousnesse, that the man of God may be perfect, prepared to euery good worke.

In which words the holy vessell of God Saint Paul, confirmeth that which he said before, to wit: that the holy scripture is able of it selfe, to instruct vs fully vnto saluation.

And the Apostle declareth this by an argument drawen from the sufficient enumeration of those partes, which are required vnto our saluation: and withall he commendeth the scriptures, of the sufficient cause, end and vse thereof.

The cause is, in that he saith the scripture is (*theópneustos,*) that is to say, giuen by the inspiration of God. The vse is foure fold, wherof the two former pertaine to doctrine: the two latter to life and maners. The cause. The vse.

For first, it is profitable to the doctrine of faithe, and holye obedience.

Secondly, to the refutation of errors, contradictions and false opinions.

Thirdly, for the correction of abuses as well publike as priuate.

Fourthly, for instruction vnto righteousnes, that is, to lead a godly and holy life.

The end is, that the man of God, to wit, hee that is the true wor- The ende.

ſhipper of God may be founde, perfecte, and moſt abſolute furniſhed in all kinde of goodneſſe. Which being ſo, wee muſt needes confeſſe, (if we will not obſtinately denie the manifeſt trueth,) that the ſcriptures containe all thinges neceſſarie for chriſtian doctrine, and for the full accompliſhment of eternall life. Neither will it helpe the papiſts to anſwere, (as their wonted manner is,) that the greeke word *(pâſa)* ſignifieth euerie, not all: ſo as the Apoſtle ſhoulde ſay, not the whole ſcripture, but euerie ſcripture. For firſt, euery ſcripture is not ſo copious or fruitfull, as it can afford vs all thoſe goodly affects, which ſainte Paul here rehearſeth.

Againe, the ſelfe ſame Greeke worde *(pâſa)* is vſed for the whole, by ſaint Pauls owne interpretation in an other place of holy ſcripture, where he hath theſe expreſſe words:

2 Cor. 13,2 κἂν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὥστε ὄρη μεθιστάνειν, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω οὐδέν εἰμὶ.

And if I haue all and the whole miraculous faith, ſo that I can remoue mountaines, but haue not loue, I am nothing.

In which place the papiſtes can not poſsiblie interprete the ſelfe ſame greeke worde, though they woulde neuer ſo gladly, but for all and the whole, becauſe otherwiſe the ſenſe would be moſt abſurd, as which would prooue ſaint Paul to ſpeake of euerie kinde of faith, and conſequently of the iuſtifying faith with the reſt: albeit, it is moſt clear, that hee ſpeaketh of the miraculous faith onely, which is often in the verie wicked.

The ſame greek word in two ſeuerall places of ſaint Mathew, is like wiſe taken for the whole.

Mat 2,v.3,4. For in the ſecond chapter it is thus written.

When king Herod heard, he was troubled and the whole cittie of Hieruſalem with him.

Where if the greeke woorde *(pâſa)* were interpretd euerie, and not the whole, the ſenſe woulde be abſurd: to wit, euerie citie of Hieruſalem, being yet but one only Hieruſalem in all. But *(pâſa)* being taken for the whole, the ſence is plaine and eaſie: to wit, the whole citie of Hieruſalem.

So in the ſixt chapter it is thus written:

Matt. 6.29. Neither was Salomon in all his glorie, araied like one of theſe,

Where if the word *(pâſa)* bee taken for euerie, the ſenſe is not currant, becauſe Chriſt compareth his bountiful prouidence ouer hearbs and flowers, not with a peece of Salomons glory, but with all and the whole.

whole. For whosoeuer shall otherwise interprete the greeke worde *pâsa*, shall no little derogate from the magnificence of Christ his prouidence, as also frustrate his comparison.

Our holy father Abraham in matters of saluation, doeth not send vs to traditions, but to the scriptures of Moses and the Prophets.

For thus it is written:

Habent Mosen & Prophetas, audiant illos. Luk 16,29

They haue Moyses and the Prophets let them heare them.

And if he had said, now the lawe is not studied, nowe the prophets are contemned: now God is not heard speaking in his word:

Some would haue angels come downe from heauen: some desire miracles, other some the dead to rise againe: But to heare Moses and the prophets, that is, to read the scriptures, is the true and only way to attaine eternall life.

And doubtlesse, if the scriptures be meanes to bring vs to saluation, (which the papistes dare not denie,) then must they be sufficient for that end, or els Christes works should be vnperfect.

For which cause saint Iohn writeth thus:

Hæc autem scripta sunt, vt credatis quod Iesus est Christus filius Dei, & vt credentes, vitam habeatis in nomine ipsius: Iohn 20,30

But these things are written, that ye may beleeue Iesus to be Christ the son of God, and that by beleefe, ye may haue life in his name.

Loe, Saint Iohn affirmeth so much to be written, as is sufficient for our beleefe through which we must be saued.

The popish glosse vpon the same text hath these words:

Hæc quæ fecit Iesus et ante resurrectionem et post, dicit se scripsisse, vt fidem astruat qua vita habeatur. Glossa ordin. super cap. 20. Iohan.

The things that Iesus did before and after his resurrection, he caused to be written, for the establishing of that faith which giueth life.

Nicolaus Lyranus their owne deare doctor, confirmeth the same in these words:

In nomine eius. i. per fidem nominis Christi, quia secundum quod dicitur, Act. 4. neque enim aliud nomen est sub cœlo datum hominibus, in quo nos oporteat saluos fieri. Lyran. in c 20 Ioan.

In his name, that is, through faith of the name of Christ, because as is saide in the actes: there is no other name vnder heauen giuen vnto men, in which we can be saued.

S. Hierome, though so much liked of the papistes, is not for all that dissonant from the rest.

For thus doth he write.

Ergo nec parentum, nec maiorem error sequendus est, sed auctoritas scriptu-
Hier. in 9. cap Ier. tom. 5 *rarum, & Dei docentis imperium.*

Therefore we must neither follow the errour of our parents, nor of our ancestors: but the authority of the scriptures, and the commandement of God that teacheth vs. S. August. that graue father, that glistering beame, that strong piller of Christs church, doeth auouch the same trueth in words yet more manifest, writing in this manner:

Augst in Ioā. tract. 49 to. 9. in init. *Cum multa fecisset Dom. Iesus, non omnia scripta sunt: electa sunt autem quæ scriberentur, quæ saluti credentium sufficere videbantur.*

Whereas our Lord Iesus did many things, all were not written, but so much was appointed to bee written, as was thought sufficient for the saluation of the faithfull,

What more forceable words can be wished? what more effectuall narration can be expected? what more sensible speeches can be vsed? yet if it be possible to say more herein, the selfe same August. will performe it in another place, where he hath these expresse words.

Aug. de doct. rina Christ. l. 2. c. 9. tom. 3. *In his enim quæ aperte in scriptura posita sunt, inueniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque viuendi, spem scilicet, atque charitatem.*

For in those things which are plainely set downe in the scripture, are found all those thinges, which containe our faith and manners, that is, hope, and charity.

Al things necessary to saluation, are plainly set downe in the Scripture.

Loe, all thinges that concerne faith, hope, and charitie, are plainely found in holy scripture: where it is diligently to be obserued, that Saint Augustine doth not onely say, that all things conteining faith, hope, and charitie, are to be found in the scripture: but he doth further say, that all such things are plainly set downe in the scriptures.

Wherevpon I inferre this notable document against popish doctrine, that albeit many thinges in many places of the scripture bee obscure and intricate, (which I willingly graunt vnto the papistes,) and consequently, that the same surpasse the capacity and iudgemente of the vulgar sort: yet are all things concerning our beleefe, concerning our maners, concerning our hope, concerning our charity, concerning our saluation so plaine and so manifest, as euery one euen of the meanest iudgement, may easily perceiu, and vnderstand the same: and this the papists must perforce grant vnto me, neither will I require more at their hands.

This is confirmed by my Lord of Rochester, their learned Bishoppe and reputed martire.

For

For these be his words, as he himselfe hath vttered them.

Scriptura sacra conclaue quoddam est omnium veritatum, quæ Christianis scitu necessaria sunt. Roffensis art. 37. aduers. Luth. p. 411

The holy scripture is a cellar, parlour, or storehouse of all truthes, which are needfull to be known of Christians.

NOW gentle reader, by this Bishops confession it is euident, that popish vnwritten traditions are not needful or necessary for christians: and so with no reason can they be thrust vpon vs.

Dionysius Areopagita, who liued in the apostles time, is of the same mind.

These are his words:

Omnino igitur non audendum est, quicquam de summa abstrusaque diuinitate aut dicere, aut cogitare, præter ea quæ nobis diuinitus scripta diuina enuntiarunt. Dyonis. Areopag. de diuin. nomin. cap. 1. in initio.

In no wise therefore may we make bold to speake, or to thinke any thing of the most high and ineffable diuinity: but that only, which holy writ hath reuealed vnto vs from heauen.

Melchior Canus, albeit he labor with tooth and naile to proue the consent of the fathers, to yeeld vs an vndoubted argumẽt of the truth: yet can he not denie that the scripture is perfect and most sufficient in euery respect. Canus de locis l. 7. cap. 3. pag. 228.

These are his words:

Sed quærat hic forsitan aliquis: cum sit perfectus scripturarum canon, sibique ad omnia satis superque sufficiat: quid opus est, vt ei sanctorum & intelligentia iungatur & auctoritas.

But some man happily here will demaund: that since the canon of the scripture is perfect, and most sufficient of it selfe to euery ende, and in euery respect: what need haue we to ioyne with the same, either in exposition or the authoritie of the fathers.

Thus saith Canus, not denying the sufficiencie of the holy scripture: but requiring the commentaries of the fathers, for the better vnderstanding of the same: whose opinion in that respect I doe not wholy dislike, as is already declared in the ninth chapter.

This being so, it followeth by a necessary consequent, that neither young nor old, rich nor poore, men nor women, learned nor vnlearned, ought to be debarred from reading of the scriptures: which my doctrine was altogether practicall, in the ancient & primitiue church.

For confirmation whereof, no greater testimonie can be had, then

the old vulgar tranſlations of the bibles.

In which behalfe, I ſawe verie lately to my greate comfort in the lybrarie of Emanuell Colledge in Cambridge, an Engliſh Bible of ſuch antiquite, as I could not vnderſtand perfectly the greater parte of the wordes. Which is an euident demonſtration, that bibles were in old time tranſlated into the vulgar tong, ſo as the common people might read them.

Thomas Aquinas, (whoſe perſon the church of Rome hath canonized for a ſainte, and his doctrine for authenticall,) teacheth vs not to beleeue any thing concerning God, ſaue that onely which is conteyned in the ſcripture expreſſely, or at leaſt ſignificantly.

Theſe be his wordes:

Aquin p.1.q. 36.ar.2.ad primum. *Dicendum quod de deo dicere non debemus, quod in ſacra ſcriptura non inuenitur, vel per verba, vel per ſenſum.*

Wee muſt anſwere, that nothing is to be verified of God, which is not conteined in holy writ, either expreſſely, or elſe in ſenſe.

And in another place, the ſame Aquinas ſaith thus:

Aquin.p.3.q 42.ar.4.ad.1. *Quicquid enim ille (Chriſtus) de ſuis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc ſcribendum illis tanquam ſuis manibus imperauit.*

For whatſoeuer Chriſt would haue vs to read of his doings and ſayings, that he commanded his apoſtles to write, as if he had done it with his owne hands.

In which wordes *Aquinas* avoucheth moſt plainly, that all thinges neceſſary for our ſaluation, are cõteined in the ſcriptures. For in Chriſts deeds, are conteined his miracles, his life, his conuerſation: in his ſayings are conteined his preaching, his teaching, and his doctrine.

If then this bee true as it moſt true, (for the Papiſtes neither canne nor will denye *Aquinas*,) that whatſoeuer Chriſt woulde haue vs to knowe, of his miracles, of his life, of his conuerſation, of his preaching, of his teaching, of his doctrine, the ſame is nowe written in the ſcriptures: no man doubteleſſe, but hee that will *cum ratione inſanire*, can denie all things neceſſary for our ſaluation, to be conteined in the holy ſcriptures.

Vict.de ſacrã pag.120 With *Aquinas* agreeth their owne renowned profeſſour and deare frier Franciſcus Victoria, whoſe words are theſe:

Non eſt mihi certum licet omnes dicant, quòd in ſcriptura non continetur.

I doe not thinke it certaine, albeit writers ſay ſo, becauſe I cannot find it in the ſcripture.

A-

Againe in another place, he writeth in this manner:

Propter quas (opiniones) nullo modo debemus diſcedere a regula & ſyncerita-te ſcripturarum. Victor.relect 8 de augmen. char.pa.308.

For which opinions wee muſt by no meanes departe, from the rule and ſincerity of the ſcriptures. I could ſay much more herein, but nothing can be more effectuall againſt the papiſts, then to confute them by their owne approued doctors. And my deſire alſo is, to auoide all ſuperfluous words.

The ſecond Concluſyon.

ALL perſons ought to reade the ſcriptures diligently, becauſe out of them euen the ſimpleſt of all may gather ſo much, as ſhall bee neceſſary for their ſaluation.

This I ſay, againſt that popiſh, ridiculous, vnchriſtian, and peſtilent abuſe, in which they deliuer in way of traditiõ to the people, the ſcriptures, ſacraments, and church ſeruice, in a ſtrange toung to them vnknowen, which their vngodly and intollerable dealing. Saint Chriſoſtome moſt ſharpely reprooueth in many places, whereof I will onely alledge ſome few.

In his commentarie vpon Saint Paul, he hath theſe words:

Et vos itaque ſi lectioni cum animi alacritate volueritis attendere, nullo alio preteria opus habebitis. Verus enim eſt ſermo Chriſti cum dicit, quærite et inuenietis, pulſate et aperietur, verum quia plures ex vs qui huc conuenere, et liberorum educationem et vxoris curam gubernandæq; domus in ſe ſe receperunt, atque ideo non ſuſtinent totos ſe labori iſti addicere, ſaltem ad percipienda quæ alij collegerũt excitamini, tantum vs quæ dicuntur audiendis impendite diligentiæ, quantum colligendis pecunijs: tametſi enim turpe ſit non niſi tãtum a vobis exigere, tamen conenti erimus, ſi vel tantum preſtetis: nam hinc innumera mala nata ſunt, quod ſcripturæ ignorantur. Hinc erupit multa illa hæreſeon pernicies, hinc vita diſſoluta, hinc inutiles labores: quẽadmodum enim qui luce iſta priuati ſunt, recta vtiq; non pergunt: ita qui ad radios diuinarum ſcripturarum non reſpiciunt, multa cogũtur continuo delinquere, vtpote in longe peioribus tenebris ambulantes: quod ne nobis vſu veniat, oculos ad ſplendorem apoſtolicorum verborum aperiamus. Chryſoſt. in proæmio epiſ ad Rom.

If therefore ye will reade the ſcriptures with alacrity of minde, you ſhall need no other help at all: for Chriſts word is true.

When he ſayeth:

Seeke, and yee ſhall finde: knocke, and it ſhall bee opened vnto you.

But for that many of you are charged with wiues, children, and domeſticall

domesticall regiment, and so cannot wholy addict your selues to this studie: and yet at least be ready to heare what others haue gathered, and bestow so much dilligence in hearing what is said, as you doe in scraping wordely goodes together: for although it bee a shame to aske no more of you, yet will I bee contente, if yee dooe so much.

For this is the cause of the infinite euils, that you are ignorant in the scriptures. From hence springeth the manifolde mischiefe of heresies, from hence dissolute life, from hence vaine, and vnprofitable labours.

For euen as they that are depriued of this light, can not goe on the right way: so they that do not behold the beames of holye scripture, are enforced incontinently to offend in many thinges, as walkinge in farre greater darkenesse.

This is the censure of S. *Chrysostome:* out of which I note.

First, that whosoeuer studieth the scriptures seriously, and with alacrity, shall finde therein, and vnderstande so much, as is necessarie for his saluation. And consequently, that our disholy father the Pope, debarreth vs of the ordinarie meanes of our saluation: when he vpon paine of excommunication, inhibiteth vs to reade the scriptures in our vulgar tongue, vnlesse wee haue his licence and dispensation so to doe.

I note secondlie, that if it be a shame for such as are charged with wiues, children, and families, onely to heare sermons, and not to studie the scriptures withall: much more it is a shame for others that be more free, not to reade them diligently: and greatest shame of all for a bishop to approue them that will not so do.

I note thirdly, that heresies, dissolute life, and all other euils, proceed of ignorance, and not reading the scriptures.

Againe, the said *Chrysostome* in another place hath these words.

Chrysost. in c. 9. Gen. ho. 29. tom. 1

Propterea ob sacro, vt subinde huc veniatis, & diuinæ scripturæ lectionem diligenter auscultetis: nec solum cum huc venitis, sed & domi diuina biblia in manus sumite, & vtilitatem in illis positam magno studio suscipite. & paulo post: tantum igitur lucrum oro, ne per negligentiam amittemus, sed & domi vacemus diuinarum scripturarum lectioni: & hic præsentes non in nugis & in vtilibus colloquijs tempus decoquamus.

I beseech you therefore, that you come hither now and then, and attend diligently the hearing of holy scripture: neither onely when yee

come

come hither, but at home also take the holy bibles into your hands, & with great studie receiue commoditie which is in them conteined. I pray you therefore let vs not negligently loose so great gaine: but when wee are at home, let vs then apply our selues to reade the holie scriptures and being here let vs not spend our time idely and vainely.

And in another place he speaketh in this maner.

Hoc igitur pacto, si scripturas diligenter scrutari voluerimus, salutem assequi poterimus: si penitus in eis versabimur, & doctrinam rectam & vitam erudiemur. Et paulo post: Non enim fieri potest, vt qui Deum & audiat, & alloquatur, non assequatur vtilitatem, sequitur: vacemus ergo scripturis dilectissimi, et saltem euangelijs, ea frequenter pertractemus. *Chrys. hom. 52. in cap. 8. Iuhã.*

By this manner then if we will search the scriptures diligently, we shall attaine saluation: if we shall be wholie conuersant in them, we shall be taught both right doctrine and good life. For it cannot bee but he shall get profit, that both heareth and talketh with God.

Let vs therefore studie the scriptures, (my deareſt,) and at the leaſt let vs often reade the holye gospels.

In and by which wordes (as wee see most euidentle,) Sainte *Chrysostome* greatly lamenteth, that the people in his time were so neglygent, in reading the holy Scriptures, what therefore would that holy father say, if he liued in these our daies, when the Pope burneth such scriptures as the people vnderstande? when the Pope commaundeth all things to be done in strange tongues? when the Pope excommunicateth all lay persons be they neuer so well learned, that reason in matters of their faith? Popish excõmunication is condemnd by S. Chrisost

What woulde he say, if he hearde priests pronounce absolution in their popish sacrament of penance, which neither the penitents, nor the priestes themselues doe oftentimes vnderstand. *6 decret. l5. cap quicunque*

Naye, what woulde hee saye, if hee were this daye in Romishe Churches, where they doe not onely read their church-seruice in Latine, but also Latine homilies, or Sermons vnto the vulgar, whiche yet they tearme, an exposition of the Scripture? Which thinge is done in euerie festiuall daye of nine Lessons in the tyme of Mattins.

In fine, what woulde hee saye, if hee knewe the rude vulgar sorte commaunded to heare the gospell read in Latine: and withall should see them listening with their eares, leaste any worde shoulde not bee hearde, though impossible to bee vnderstoode? woulde he not, and

mighte hee not iuſtlie ſaye with the holye Apoſtle, that they were madde?

1 Cor 1, 14 verſe 24.

Yes doubtleſſe.

Origen hom 4 ſuper Levit. prope finē

Origen, who liued aboue a thouſande and three hundred yeeres ſithence, doth not onely exhort the people ſeriouſly to read the ſcriptures: but withall ſheweth plainely, that in his time, they were reade in the vulgar tongue.

Theſe are his words:

Certe ſi non omnia poſſumus, ſaltem ea quæ nunc docentur in eccleſia, vel quæ recitantur, memoriæ commendemus.

Doubleſſe, if wee cannot beare awaye all thinges conteined in the ſcriptures, at leaſt let vs remember thoſe things, which are taught, and read in the Church.

In which words he ſpeaketh not onely of ſermons, but alſo of the goſpels, epiſtles, praiers, leſſons, and hiſtories of the Bible. For ſermons are conteined in the word *(docentur)* which are preached, and the reſt in the word *(recitantur)* which are read or rehearſed.

And if ſuch things had bene read in a ſtrange tongue the vulgar ſort could not haue committed them to memory.

Saint *Auguſtine* doth not onely exhort to read the ſcriptures, but alſo giueth great encouragement therto, auouching that the ſcriptures may be vnderſtood with all facilitie.

Aug. de doctr. Chriſt. l. 2. c. 6.

Magnifice igitur & ſalubriter ſpiritus ſanctus ita ſcripturas ſanctas modificauit, vt locis apertioribus fami occurreret, obſcuroribus autem faſtidia detergeret.

The Holi-ghoſt hath ſo magnifically and healthfully meaſured the holy ſcriptures, that in the obſcure places lothſomnes is taken away: and with the places that be plaine and eaſie, our hunger is ſatisfyed. And his reaſon hereof followeth in theſe next words.

Nihil enim fere de illis obſcuritatibus eruitur, quod non planiſſime dictum alibi reperiatur.

For almoſte nothinge is conteined in obſcure places, which is not moſt plainely vttered in ſome other place, ſo then by the teſtimonie of this holy father, ſo auncient for antiquitie, ſo holye for vertue, ſo graue for auctoritie, ſo profound for his iudgment, ſo rare for his wit, ſo renowned for his learning, that the papiſtes hitherto haue admired his doctrine as an oracle from heauen: the holye ſcriptures are eaſie to be vnderſtood: and whatſoeuer is obſcurely ſpoken in one place, the

Lo the ſcriptures ar plain and eaſie.

the same is plainly told in another.

To conclude, the practise of those godlie Christians, of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles, decideth this controuersie sufficiently: as who being meere lay-men, did notwithstanding study the Scriptures most seriously. Act. 17, v. 11.

The 3. Conclusion.

TRaditions are to be examined by the holye Scriptures, the true touchstone of verity: and to be admitted, when they are found consonant to the same.

This conclusion is euidently proued, by the iudgement practicall of Saint Cyprian. For he being required by Stephanus then Bishoppe of Rome to yeeld vnto Traditions, did not tearme the said Stephanus by the tytle of Pope, or Holinesse (as now the Romish manner is) but by the name of fellow or brother, and calling him blind bayard) not saint Peters successour, who could not erre) did contemne and vtterly reiect that Tradition, which the saide Stephanus requested him to yeelde vnto. Where was the magnificēce of pope dome then?

His very owne words are these:

Nihil innovetur, inquit, nisi quod traditum est? vnde est ista traditio? vtrum ne de dominica & evangelica auctoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis atq; epistolis veniens? ea enim facienda esse quæ scripta sunt, Deus testatur, & proponit ad Iesum Nave, dicens: non recedet liber legis huius ex ore tuo, sed meditaberis in eo die ac nocte, vt observes facere omnia quæ scripta sunt item, Dominus apostolos suos mittens, mandat baptizari gentes & doceri, vt observent omnia quæcunq; ille præcepit. Si ergo aut in Evangelio præcipitur, aut Apostolorum epistolis, aut actibus continetur, vt à quacunque hæresi venientes non baptizentur, sed tantum manus illis imponantur in pœnitentiam, observetur etiam & hæc sancta traditio. Cyprian ad ponpeium, pag. 228.

Let nothing be renewed, saith Pope Stephanus, but let that be don which was receiued by tradition. From whence came this Tradition? whether doeth it descende from the auethority of our Lorde and of his Gospell, or commeth it from the Epistles, or actes of the Apostles? For GOD testifieth that those thinges must be doone which are written, and propoundeth them vnto *Nave*, saying: Let not the book of this law depart out of thy mouth, but meditate in it day and night,

that thou maieſt obſerue to do all things that are written. Our Lorde alſo ſending foorth his Apoſtles, chargeth them to baptize the gentiles, and to teach them to do all things which he commanded them. If therefore it be commanded in the goſpell, or in the epiſtles of the apoſtles, or acts, that ſuch as came from any hereſie ſhould not be baptiſed, but onely receiue impoſition of handes for penance, then let this holy tradition be obſerued.

Thus we ſee that this ancient father, canonized by the pope for an holy and bleſſed martir, will indeede admitte traditions, (as the wiſer ſort of proteſtants do admitte with him,) but yet no other traditions, then are found conſtant to the ſcriptures.

How traditions ought to be examined.

By which ſcriptures Saint Cyprian examineth the veritie of all traditions, admitting thoſe that be conſonant, and reiecting ſuch as bee diſſonant from the ſame. At what time the Arrians woulde not admit the worde (*Omooùſion,*) becauſe it was not founde in the ſcriptures, the fathers of the councell did not then alledge traditions for proofe ther of, neither did they ſay, that many things muſt be belieued, which are not written.

But they anſwered ſimply, that though that word were not expreſly written: yet was it virtually, and effectually contained in the ſcriptures, which thing is euident by the teſtimonie of Athanaſius, who writeth in this manner.

Athanaſ. de decret Nicen ſyn to. 2. prope finẽ.

Sed tamen cognoſcat quiſquis eſt ſtudioſioris animi, has voces tametſi in ſcripturis non reperiantur, habere tamen eas eam ſententiam quam ſcripturæ volunt.

Although the woordes bee not founde in the ſcripture, yet haue they that meaning and ſence which the ſcripture approoueth, and intendeth, as euery one that ſtudieth the ſcripture ſeriouſly, may eaſily vnderſtand.

Origen giueth counſell to trie all doctrines by the ſcriptures, euen as pure gold is tried by the touch ſtone.

Thus doth he write:

Origen. in Matthæum. 25

Debemus ergo ad teſtimonium omnium verborum quæ proferimus in doctrina, preferre ſenſum ſcripturæ, quaſi confirmantem quem exponimus ſenſum: ſicut enim omne aurum quodquod fuerit extrà templum, non eſt ſanctificatum, ſic omnis ſenſus qui fuerit extra divinam ſcripturam (quamuis admirabilis videatur quibuſdam:) non eſt ſanctus, qui non continetur a ſenſu ſcripturæ, quæ ſolet

eum

eum sensum solum sanctificare quem habet in se, sicut templum proprium aurum. Non ergo debemus ad confirmandam doctrinam nostram nostros proprios intellectus iurare, & quasi testimonia assumere, quæ vnusquisque nostrum intelligit, & secundem veritatem æstimat esse: ni ostenderit eos sanctos esse ex eo, qui in scripturis continetur divinis quasi in templis quibusdam Dei. Stulti ergo et cæci omnes qui non cognoscunt, quin templum, id est, lectio scripturarum, magnũ & venerabilem facit sensum, sicut aurum sacratum.

We must therefore alledge the sense of scripture, for the testimonie of euerie word we vtter in doctrine, as which confirmeth the sense of our exposition.

For as all golde which is without the temple is not sanctified: so euery sense which is without the holy scripture (albeit it seem to some wonderfull,) is vnholie, because it is not conteined in the sense of scripture: which onely sanctifieth that sense which it hath in it selfe, as the temple sanctifyeth the golde. Wee must not therefore for the confirmation of our doctrine, sweare to the sense, which euerie one of vs vnderstandeth, and conceiueth to be true, vnlesse we can shewe it to be diuine, because it is contained in the diuine scriptures: as in the temple of God.

Foolish therefore and blinde are all those, who knowe not that the temple, to wit, the reading of scriptures, maketh the sense greate and venerable, as hallowed gold.

In another place, the said Origen hath these words:

Quærimus verba quæ dicta sunt, juxta personæ dignitatem exponere: quapropter necesse est nobis scripturas sanctas in testimoniũ vocare. Sensus quippe nostri & enarrationes, sine ijs testibus non habent fidem. Origen hom. 1. in 1. cc. Iere.

Wee seeke to expound the words rehearsed, according to the dignitie of the person: wherefore we must of necessitie, cal the holy scriptures to witnes.

For our iudgements and expositions without those witnesses, are of no credite at all.

Thus we see, Origen his iudgement, and that nothing can be of credite, which is not grounded vpon the scriptures.

But what? is Origen onely of this opinion? no verily, for all ancient, graue, and learned fathers, are of the selfe same mind.

Saint *Augustine* writing against Petilianus, hath these words:

Promde, sive de Christo, sive de eius ecclesia, sive de quacunque alia re qua pertenet ad fidem vitamq; nostram, nos aut angelus de cœlo vobis annunciaverit Aug. cont lit. Petilian l. 3 cap. 6. tom. 7

preterquam quod in scripturis legalibus & euangelicis accepistis, anathema sit.

Wherefore, whether we speake of Christ, or of his church, or of what other matter soeuer, which appertaineth to faith or manners, whether we, or an angell from heauen shall announce otherwise then ye haue receiued in the scriptures of the law and the gospell, accursed be that man.

The same S. Augustine in another place hath these words:

Aug. de vnit. eccles. c. 10 non longe ab initio.

Nemo mihi dicat, O quid dixit Donatus, aut quid dixit Parmenianus, aut Pontius, quilibet illorum: quia nec catholicis episcopis consentiendum est, si cubi forte fallantur, vt contra canonicas Dei scripturas aliquid sentiant.

Let no man say to mee, Oh what said Donatus, or what said Parmenianus, or Pontius or any of them: because we must not consent to catholike bishops, if they chaunce to erre in any thing, and speake against the canonicall scriptures.

Saint Chrisostome agreeth vniformely vnto the rest, writing in this manner.

Chryso. in c. 24 Mat. hom. 49

Cum videritis hæresim impiam quæ est exercitus antichristi stantem in locis sanctis ecclesiæ, in illo tempore qui in Iudæa sunt fugiant ad montes, id est, qui sunt in Christianitate conferant se ad scripturas: & quare iubet in hoc tempore omnes christianos conferre se ad scripturas? quia in tempore hoc ex quo obtulit hæresis illas ecclesias, nulla probatio potest esse vera christianitatis, neque refugium potest esse christianorum aliud volentium cognoscere fidei veritatem, nisi scripturæ diuinæ.

When you shall see wicked heresie, which is Antichristes armie, standing in the holy church: at that time they that be in Iury must flie to the mountaines, that is, they that are christians must flee vnto the scriptures.

And why commaundeth he at this time all Christians to flee to the scripture? because at that time, when heresie hath yeilded vp the churches, no proofe can bee had of true christianitie, neither any other refuge is left to christians desirous to know the verity of faith, but onely the holy scriptures.

Againe, the saide Chrisostome saith in another place after this manner:

Chrysost. in Psal. 95. prope finem. tom. 2

Neque enim quicquam dicere oportet sine testibus, solaq; animi cogitatione nam si quid dicatur absque scriptura, auditorum cogitatio claudicat, nunc annuens nunc hæsitans, & interdum sermonem vt frivolum aversans, interdum vt probabilem recipiens: verum vbi e scriptura diuina vocis prodijt testimonium, & loquē-

tis

tis sermonem, & audientis animum confirmat.

Neither must wee say any thing without witnesses, and vppon our owne cogitation onely. For if any thing be spoken without the scripture, the cogitation of the auditors halteth, sometime granting, sometime doubting, sometime reiecting that which is spoken as friuolous, & sometime accepting it as probable. But when testimony is brought out of the scripture of Gods word, then it confirmeth both the wordes of the speaker, and the mind of the hearer.

And yet the said Chrisostome hath another place, well woorthy to be written in golden letters.

Thus he saith:

Quomodo autem non absurdum est propter pecunias alijs non credere, sed ipsas numerare & supputare, prorebus autem amplioribus aliorum sententiam sequi simpliciter: presertim cum habeamus omnium exactissimam trutinam, & gnomonem ac regulam, diuinarum inquam legum assertionem. Ideo, obsecro & oro omnes vos, vt relinquatis quidnam huic vel illi videatur: deque his a scripturis hac etiam inquirete, & veras diuitias discentes eas sectemur, vt & aeterna bona assequamur. Chrysost. in 2 cor. ca. 7 hom. 13. in fine.

How is it not absurd for money not to credite others, but to tell the money our selues, and yet for more important matters, to followe simplie the iudgemente and opinion of others: especiallie, when wee haue the most exact ballance and rule, I meane the assertion of all diuine lawes. I therefore pray and beseech you all, that you let passe what this man, or that man thinketh, & search al things out of the scriptures: and learning true riches let vs follow them, that so we may attaine eternall beatitude.

Behold here a most godly exhortation, and graue aduise, giuen vs by this holy father. As we will not saith he, trust others to tel our money, but tell it our selues: much lesse should we trust others, depending vpon them in matter of our saluation, but should our selues learne and know the same, by diligent reading of the scriptures.

Neither must wee beleeue and doe what this or that man saith, but what we finde to be true, by painfull studie of the scriptures.

For which cause, wisely and graucly said Tertullian:

Idesse verum quodcunque primum, id esse adulterum quodcunque posterius. Tertul. aduers. praxet in initio.

That is, that to be true, whatsoeuer was first, and that to be counterfet whatsoeuer came after.

And

Psal 1, 119 num.

And for the same end said the holy Prophet:

Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum, & lumen semitis meis.

Thy word is a lanterne vnto my feet, and a light vnto my paths.

As if he had said, of our selues we are but darkenesse, and cannot see, except we be lightned with Gods word. And consequently if we desire to haue our sight, our chiefest and principall sight, the inward and spirituall sight of our soules: we must employ our whole industrie in reading the holy scriptures, and with all humblenesse of minde study them day and night.

The 4. Conclvsyon.

POpish traditions are so vncertaine and doubtfull, as the best learned Papists are at great contention about them, and cannot possibly be accorded therein. For the exact proofe of this conclusion that intollerable and endlesse strife, which was a thousande and foure hundred yeares sithence betweene Victor then bishop of Rome, and other bishops of Asya, may suffice if nothing else were saide. For on both sides tradition apostolicall was alledged and stoutlie avouched, for and concerning the celebration of Easter.

Of this matter, thus writeth Eusebius Cæsariensis.

Euseb. Cæsariens. l. 5. c. 13 hist. eccles.

Episcopis autem in Asya coactis, qui morem iam olim ipsis à maioribus traditum sedulo obseruandum constanter asseverabant, præfuit Polycrates. qui in ea epistola quam ad Victorem & ecclesiam Romanam scripsit, traditionem ad ipsius vsque tempora deductam, his fere verbis exponit. Nos diem paschatis integre incorrupteq; recolimus, neq; addendo quicquam, neq; detrahendo.

The Bishop. of Asya assembled in councell, *Polycrates* beeing president, affirmed constantly, that that custome ought to bee obserued, which they of old time had receiued by tradition. which tradition to haue beene continuall vntill his daies, the said Polycrates in his epist. to Victor and the church of Rome, sheweth plainly in these wordes: We keepe Easter intirely, and incorruptly: neither do we adde or detract any thing.

And in the same Epistle he telleth vs, that Philippe one of the seauen Deacons, S. Iohn the Euangelist, saint Polycarpe, Saint Papirius, Saint Melito, and others, did all obserue the same tradition.

These be his words:

Isti omnes diem paschatis 14. die Lunæ ex euangelij prescripto obseruarunt, nihil ab eo instituto ac more plane digressi: sed secundum regulam & normam fidei eum assidue tenuerunt.

All

nihil ab eo instituto ac more plane digressi: sed secundum regulam & normam fidei eum assidue tenuerunt.

All these haue obserued Easter the fourteenth day of the moone after the prescript of the Gospell, declining nothing at all from that custome and ordinance, but dayly retained it according to the rule and analogie of faith.

But Victor and other Bishops with him, defended bitterly a contrarie tradition. For thus writeth the said Eusebius of him:

Victor qui tum Rom. Ecclesiæ præerat, totius Asiæ ecclesias cum alijs finitimis, tanquam alterius fidei & opinionis, simul omnes (vt complectatur brevi) à communi vnitate ecclesiæ amputare conatur, & in eos per literas grauiter invehitur. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24 hist. eccles.

Victor then gouerning the church of Rome, indeauoureth to cut off from the common vnitie of the church, all the churches of Asia together with others adioyning, and very bitterly inueigheth against them by his letters.

Which fact of Victor, Irenæus and other Bishops sharply reproued in their letters to the said Victor. Which thing Ruffinus plainly testifieth, in these words:

Sed hoc non omnibus placebat Episcopis, quin potius & è contrario scribentes ei iubebant, vt magis quæ pacis sunt ageret, & concordiæ atque vnanimitati studeret, denique & extant ipsorum literæ, quibus asperius obiurgant victorem, velut inutiliter ecclesiæ commodis consulentem. Ruffinus in sua transl.

Yet this his dealing pleased not all Bishops, but contrariwise they wrote vnto him, bidding him to practise rather that belōged to peace, and to study for concord and vnity. Finally, their letters are also extāt, in the which they sharply chide Victor, as one that respected vnprofitably the good of the Church.

Thus saith Ruffinus. In like manner (though with more modesty) dissented Anicetus another Bishop of Rome, from S. Polycarpe bishop of Smyrna. Of which variance, thus writeth Eusebius:

Neq; tamen Anicetus Polycarpo poterat persuadere, vt suum obseruandi morem deponeret, neq; Polycarpus Aniceto persuasit, vt consuetudinem Asiaticam vllo modo obseruaret Euseb. l. 5. c. 24 hist. eccles.

Neither could Polycarpus perswade Anicetus, to keep the custome and tradition of Asia.

Now gentle reader, what need more to be said, for the vncerteintie of traditions?

For first, these Bishops that thought thus diuersly of traditions, liued within one hundred yeeres of Christ: at what time the Church was in good estate, and stained with very few or no corruptions at all.

Secondly, the one side doubtles, was seduced with false traditions.

Thirdly, S. *Polycarpe* and other holy Bishops of that age, made no more account of the bishop of Rome his opinion, or authority, then of another mans.

Fourthly, they were so farre from acknowledging him to be the supreame heade of the Church, that they all reputed themselues his equals: and controled him as sharply for his doctrin, as S. *Paul* reproued S. *Peter* for his conuersation.

Fiftly, if S. *Polycarpe* had cause in his time, being the flourishing age of the Church, to doubt of Romish traditions; much more haue wee cause in these latter daies, to stand in doubt thereof. For now hath iniquity the vper hand, now are corruptions more frequent, now doe errors in euery place more abound. Let vs therfore follow S. *Augustines* aduise, let vs admit nothing rashly, let vs examine all doubtfull traditions and doctrines, by the touchstone of veritie, the holy Scriptures. And least any man think S. *Augustine* to be of another minde, these are his owne expresse words:

Aug. de vnit. eccles. c. 3. to. 7

Non audiamus, hæc dico, hæc dicis: sed audiamus, hæc dicit dominus: sunt certi libri domini, quorum authoritati virique consentimus, vtrique credimus vtrique seruimus · ibi quæramus ecclesiam, ibi discutiamus causam nostram.

Let vs not heare, I say this, thou saiest that: but let vs heare, this saith the Lord: for our Lord hath books, whose authoritie we both admit, we both beleeue, we both obey: let vs there seeke the Church, let vs there decide our cause.

But what need many words? For either popish vnwritten traditions, are repugnant to the scriptures, or consonant to the same. If they be repugnant, then is there great reason to reiect them: if they be consonant, that must be tried by comparing them to the Scriptures, which is the conclusion I defend. But the papists perceiuing them selues to bee conuinced by the Scriptures: tell vs plainly, that they must haue their cause tried by other meanes. For so writeth my L. of *Rochester*, in these expresse termes: *Contendent ibis itaq; nobiscum hæreticis, nos alio subsidio nostram oportet tueri causam, quam Scriptura sacra.*

Rossen. verit. 4 aduers. art. Lutheri.

When therfore heretikes, (he meaneth all, not papists,) dispute with vs: we must vse other help in defence of our cause, then the Scripture. Lo, they dare not be tried by the Scripture. Which if a papist had not

spoken, who would haue beleeued it?

THE COROLLARIE.

FIrst therefore, since the written word conteineth in it selfe, euery thing necessarie for our saluation: secondly, since no traditions are to be admitted, but such as are consonant to the holy scripture: thirdly, since Papistes loade vs with huge numbers of traditions without warrant of the written word: fourthly, since popish traditions were in old time, most doubtfull and vncertaine,

I conclude, that it is a sufficient Motiue for me to renounce the Romish Religion, as false, erroneous and pernitious doctrine.

Thus much of the ninth Motive.

The XI. Chapter.

Of Popish auricular confession.

ALthough Popish doctors do wonderfully magnifie their *auricular confession*, perswading the vulgar sort, that they cannot attaine saluation without the same: yet it is indeede a meere inuention of man, the bitter torment of conscience, and the readie way to desperation. For manifest probation whereof, I proceed in this maner.

The first Conclvsyon.

ALL Christians must confesse their sinnes to God, with internall contrition of heart, with full purpose to amend their liues, and with stedfast hope of remission by the mercy of God, thorough the merites of Christ his sonne our sweet redeemer. Of this kinde of confession, the Scripture speaketh abundantly.

Delictum meum cognitum tibi feci, & iniustitiam meam non abscondi, dixi confitebor aduersum me iniustitiam meam domino, & tu remisisti impietatem peccati mei. Psal. 32, 5

I haue made my sinne known vnto thee, and mine iniustice I haue not hid. I said, I wil confesse to the Lord my iniustice against my self, and thou hast forgiuen the impiety of my sinne.

Qui abscondit scelera sua, non dirigetur: qui autem confessus fuerit & reliquerit ea, misericordiam consequetur. Prou, 28, 13

He that hideth his offences, shall not be directed: but whoe shall confesse and forsake his sinnes, shall attaine mercy.

Si dixerimus quoniam peccatum non habemus ipsi nos seducimus, & veritas in nobis non est. si confiteamur peccata nostra, fidelis est & iustus vt remittat nobis peccata nostra. 1 Ioan. 1, 8, 9 If we say we haue no sinne, we deceiue our selues, and the truth is not in vs: but if we confesse our sinnes, &c.

That this confeſſion muſt be ioyned with hope of remiſſion, S. Chriſoſtome teacheth in theſe words:

Chryſoſt. ad Theod. lapſ. *Quid proderunt lachrymæ & confeſſio ſi nulla adſit abolitionis fiducia?*

What ſhal teares & confeſſion auail, if there be no hope of forgiuenes?

And that wee muſt adde hereunto amendment of life, S. Hilarie teacheth vs, when he ſaith: *Quid aliud eſt confeſſio erroris, quam confeſſio deſinendi ab errore?*

Hilar. in 135. Pſal

What other thing is the confeſsion of errour, then to confeſſe that we will forſake errour?

So then, when we bewaile our ſins, confeſſe them, and purpoſe to amend our former liues, with ſtedfaſt hope of Gods mercy, through attonement made in Chriſtes bloud, we ſhal doubtles haue remiſſion of our ſinnes. Then though our ſinnes be as red as ſcarlet, yet ſhal they be made white as ſnow.

Eſay 1, 17

The ſecond Concluſion.

WE muſt confeſſe our ſins one to another, when we offend one another. Which fraternall reconciliatiō done vpon earth, god promiſeth to ratifie in heauen. To this confeſsion, holy writ doth ſeriouſly exhort vs in many places:

Matt. 5, 23 *Si offers munus tuum ad altare, & ibi recordatus fueris quod frater tuus habuit aliquid adverſum te, relinque ibi munus tuum ante altare, & vade prius reconciliari fratri tuo, & tunc veniens offeres munus tuum.*

If thou offer thy gift before the altar, and ſhall remember that thy brother hath ſome matter againſt thee: leaue there thy offering before the altar, and goe firſt to be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and make thy offering.

Gloſſa interl. ſupera hunc locum. This offering (ſaith the gloſſe) is the ſacrifice of a good woorke: the altar is Chriſt, to whome we muſt offer our good actions by faith. And another gloſſe ſaith:

Gloſ. ordinar. in eod. loco. *Vade non pedibus ſed animo humili te ei proſternas, in conſpectu illius cui oblaturus es: vel petendo veniam, ſi præſens eſt.*

Go not with thy feet, but fall proſtrate with an humble heart before him, to whome thou makeſt thy offering: or aske forgiueneſſe, if the partie be preſent.

Chriſt ſaith in another place:

Luc. 17, 4 *Si ſeptiés in die peccauerit in te, & ſeptiés in die converſus fuerit ad te dicens, pœnitet me, demitte illi.*

If thy brother ſhal offend thee ſeuen times a day, & ſhal ſeuen times a day

day be conuerted to thee, and say, it repenteth me, forgiue him.

Confitemini alterutrum peccata vestra iniqui apostolus, & orate pro invicem vt saluemini. Confesse your sinnes one to another, saith the Apostle, and pray one for another, that ye may be saued. Iacobi. 5, 16

The 3. Conclusyon.

THere is yet a thirde kinde of confession commended in holy writ, which is a generall confession of our sinnes: not onely internally before God, but also externally before the ministers of the worde and sacramẽts: but this kind doth not include in it a total & specifical enumeration of our sins. This maner of confession made king Dauid before the Prophet *Nathan*, when he reproued him for his offences. *Peccaui domino*, I haue sinned vnto the Lord, saith *Dauid*. And the prophet answered: *Dominus quoq; transtulit peccatum tuum*: the L. hath forgiuen thee thy sinne. In like manner the sinnefull woman, of whome S. Luke maketh mention, confessed her sins generally in tears, signes, and gestures, and receiued incontinently absolution at Christs hands: for he said vnto her, *Remittuntur tibi peccata*, thy sins are forgiuen thee. Which maner of confession is fitly described in the book of *Nehemias*, in the 8. and 9. chap. For when *Esdras* and the *Leuites* did interpret the law vnto the people, then the people acknowledging their offences and the offences of their forfathers, did lament, weep, & confesse their sins before the *Leuits* & the whole congregation: & that done, ỹ *Leuits* repeated their confession, and desired pardon of God for the same. So this day in the church of England, the people confesse their sins generally before the minister, & in the face of the whole congregatiõ. Yea, in *Germany* they confes such special sins, as grieue and clog their consciences, & for which they stand in most need to haue aduise and counsel. Which libertie is granted in England also: for such as list may confesse their sins to the minister priuatly, and haue both his aduise & absolutiõ, if he find them penitent. Which confession & absolutiõ, wold God it were more in practise then it is: because instruction and consolatiõ might redound vnto the penitent, by vertue of the same. This kind of confession was much frequented in the primitiue Church, at such time as the zeal of Gods people was great, and their deuotion feruẽt: then did all confesse their sinnes generally: then wer none commanded to confesse specifically: then did christs ministers execute their functions duely: then did S. *Iohn Baptist* in zealous maner reproue vice, extol vertue, thunder out gods wrath and ire against wicked and impenitent

2 Reg. 12, 13

Luk, 7, 38. 48

2 Esd, 8, & 9.

The true maner of confessing our sins.

It is to be wished, that confession were more vsed thẽ it is now adaies.

nitent sinners,& withal promise free pardon and remissiō of sins,to al such as wold lament their sins,amend their liues,reform their maners, and beleeu in Christ Iesus the innocent lamb,that taketh away the sins of the world. Then the Scribes,Pharisies,and great multitudes of people were inflamed with compunction at S. Iohns preaching,bewailed their former liues, confessed generally their sins, and desired baptisme for the same. Thē the holy vessel of god S.Paul,wroght great miracles by the power of god:insomuch that many of the faithful cāe vnto him confessing their sins, and such as had followed magicall arts brought their bookes together, and burnt them in the presence of the people.

Matt.3,6,7,8

act.19,18,19

The 4. Conclusion.

THe Popish specificall enumeration of all our sins, is both impossible to man,and neither commanded by Christ, nor practised by his Apostles. That it is impossible to be performed by man, the Prophet proueth when he saith :

psa,18,13 14 *Delicta quis intelligit? ab occultis meis munda me.*

Who doth vnderstand his offences?clense me from secret faults.

Prou.20,9 *Quis potest dicere,mundum est cor meum,purus sum à peccato?*

Who can say,my heart is cleane,I am free from my sinne;

Neither wil it serue their turn,to say as Cardinall Caietan doth,that confession is take two waies:to wit, absolutly;& as it is the act of man. To confesse all sinnes absolutely, is to leaue no sin vnconfessed: but to confesse all sins, as confession is the act of man, is to confesse all those sins which are in the power of man:that is,which man doth,or may remēber after diligent examination of his conscience. And therfore saith Caietan,when the gospell requireth the confession of all sins in the sacrament of penance:it is not meant of all sins absolutely, but of all sins which are in mans power to cōfesse. This distinction, I say wil not seru:

Caiet.in suum. in vlt. pagella

First,because this distinction,is not mentioned in the Gospell.

Secondly,because there is no more reason for the confession of one, then for the confession of all.

Thirdly, because this notwithstanding, a man shall alway remaine perplexe: as who can neuer tel,when he hath vsed sufficient inquisition in that behalfe.

Fourthly,because one mortall sin cannot be remitted without another,as all papists confes;& consequently,either the secret not confessed mortals,are remitted with the confessed mortals,or none at al be remitted by the absolution: if they answere, that none are remitted,because

cause some are not confessed: then shall the penitent neuer haue absolution, because he can neuer confesse all as is proued: if they say, the secret not confessed mortals, be remitted with the other: then is it not needful to confes them after, when they come to remembrãce: which yet all papists require, as necessarie to saluation.

Fiftly, because it followeth herupon, that penitents are bound to cõfesse their sinnes very many times, which the Popes law requireth but once in the yeare. I proue it, because if they stay any time from confession, they may forget their sins through their own default, and so make frustrate their absolution.

Sixtly, because the priests are often so ignorant, that they cannot distinguish mortall and veniall sins: which yet is necessarie in absolution,

Seuenthly, because the priest standeth often excommunicate, and often dealeth with reserued cases, and a thousãd such like things chance in absolutiõ. Yea, the archpapists this day, perceiuing this matter to be so intricate & dangerous: partly by reasõ of the cases so reserued, partly by reason of inumerable excõmunications, and partly by reason of ignorance in their priestes: haue inuented this poore shift for an help, if it may be: to wit, that the Pope shal giue euery seminarie priest, full authority to absolue from all excommunications and reserued cases whatsoeuer: so that now we haue so many virtuall popes in England, as seminary priests. For euery one of thẽ, hath *plenitudinem potestatis:* and it is a world to cõsider, how this power is vsed. For because neither the penitẽt, nor the priest cã tel, how oftẽ the party is excõmunicat: the priest for security, pronounceth euery time ouer euery person, these wordes:

I absolve thee from euerie bond of excommunication, so farre foorth as I can, and thou standest neede. And this done in latine.

All which frustrate the same, and open to the penitent the gate of desperation. That this maner of confession, is neither commanded by Christ, nor practised by his Apostles: may be euidently proued by their owne canon-law, as their owne doctors testifie.

Thus writeth the great Thomist Sylvester Prieras:

Quarto, vtrum ad confessionem teneamur diuino iure vel humano? & dico quod canonistæ videntur tenere, quod sit de iure positivo. & ad hoc est glossa de pen. dist. v. in summa, quæ vult quod instituta sit à quadam vniuersali traditione ecclesiæ: ideo infert, quod infiteri non tenentur infideles, nec similiter græci, ex quo non acceptauerunt huiusmodi constitutionem, sicut nec votum castitatis. Sylvest. de confess. secundo par. 4.

It is demanded fourthly, (saith the great papist Sylvester) whether we

be

be bound to popish confession, by the law of God, or by the positiue law of man? and I say, the canonists hold, that we are but bound by the law of mā. And of this opinion is the glosse, which is of this mind, that confession was institute by a certain vniuersal tradition of the church; whereupon the said glosse inferreth, that infidels are not boūd to confession, neither the Greeks in like maner: since they did neuer approue such constitution, no more then the vow of chastitie.

De pœnit. d. 1 cap quamvis plenit.

Yea, the Popes own decrees admit no lesse: for these are the words of his canons; *Quibus authoritatibus vel quibus rationū firmamentis vtrag3 sententia satisfactionis & confessionis nitatur, in medium breviter exposuimus. cui autem harum potius adhærendum sit, lectoris iudicio reservatur. vtrag3 enim fautores habet sapientes & religiosos viros.*

Vpon what authorities or foundations of reasons either opinion is grounded, I haue briefly shewed. Now to whether of them, the reader should adhere, I leaue it to his own discretion. For either opinion hath wise and religious men, for the patrons of the same.

Beholde here gentle reader, that not only the Popes doctors, but his owne canon law, and the commenters vpon the same: do al confesse, that confession after popish maner, is onely grounded vpon mans law. Yea, the glosse addeth, that both wise and religious men do so thinke, though some others holde the contrary.

Navar. in enchir. cap. 2. de confess. n. 3.

Martinus Nauarrus, (though he hold a contrarie opinion to the canonists,) confesseth plainly that their solemne glosse commonly receiued and approued of all canonists, holdeth confession to be commanded by the Church.

The famous Canonist and honourable Archbishop *Panormitanus*, was of the same opinion with the glosse, as confesseth *Couarruuias* in these words:

Couar. tom. 2 par. 1. pag 155

Quam ex nostris plerig3 secuti sunt, maximè Panormitanus: ex ea asserentes confessionem sacramentalem quæ Sacerdotibus fit, iure humano institutam esse.

Which glosse many of our canonists haue followed, especially Panormitan: affirming out of that glosse, that sacramental confession which is made to priests, was ordeined by the law of man.

This to be true, S. Chrisostome confirmeth in these words:

Chrysost. supra cap. 12. ad hebræ. hom. 31. post. med. eiusd tom. 4.

Non tibi dico vt te prodas in publicum, neq3 apud alios te accuses: sed obedire te volo Propheta dicenti, revela domino viam tuam. ante deum ergo tua confitere peccata: apud verum iudicem cum oratione dilecta tua pronuncia, non lingua, sed conscientia tua memoria, & tunc demum spera te misericordiam posse cōsequi

I doe not bid thee come forth in publike, neither to accuse thy selfe before others: but I would haue thee to obey the Prophet, when hee saith, reueale thy way to God. Before God therfore confesse thy sins, before the true iudge in praier pronounce thine offences, not with thy tongue, but with the memorie of thy conscience: and then hope to haue mercy.

And in another place, the same S. Chrysostome hath these words: *Chrysost. apud Lombard in 4 s. dist. 17.*

Peccata tua quotidie dicito, vt deleas ea. sed si confunderis alicui dicere, dicito ea quotidie in animo tuo. non dico vt confitearis ea conseruo tuo, vt tibi exprobet. dicito deo, qui curat ea.

Confesse thy sinnes daily, that thou maist blot them out. But if thou be ashamed to confesse them to another, confesse them daile in thyne hart. I do not bid thee confesse them to thy fellow seruant, that he may vpbraide thee. Confesse them to God, who can cure the same.

Saint *Augustine* is very plaine in this pointe, for these are his expresse words:

Quid mihi ergo est cum hominibus vt audiant confessiones meas, quasi ipsi sanaturi sint omnes languores meos? curiosum genus ad cognoscendam vitam alienam, desidiosum ad corrigendam suam. quid à me quærunt audire qui sim, qui nolunt à te audire qui sint? & vnde sciunt cum à me ipso de me ipso audiunt; an verum dicam, quandoquidem nemo scit hominum quid agatur in homine nisi spiritus hominis qui in ipso est. *Aug. lib. 10 confess. cap. 3 tom. 1*

What haue I therfore to do with men, that they must hear my confessions? as though they should heale al my diseases? a curious kinde to know another mans life, and sluggish to correct their owne. Why seek they to heare of me what I am, who will not heare of thee, what them selues are? And how knowe they when they heare me tell of my selfe, that I say truely? since no man knoweth what is done in man, but the spirit of man that is in him.

These are S. *Augustines* owne words, so plaine and effectual against Popish, vnchristian, foolish, and execrable confession, as nothing more needeth to be said therein.

The fifth Conclusion.

ALbeit popish aricular confessiō be so magnified with papists, that euery one is commaunded vnder paine of damnation to beleeue the same, as instituted by Christ himselfe: yet was it not an article of popish faith, for the space of one thousand and fiue hundred yeeres af-

ter Christ. This conclusion, because it is very important, I shall desire thee, gentle Reader, to ponder deeply with me my discourse.

Iosephus Angles Valentinus a popish fryer, and bishop of Bosana, in the second tome of that worke, which he dedicated to the Pope himselfe *Sixtus Quintus*, hath these expresse words:

Ioseph. Ang. in 4. s. q. de confes pag. 255.

Ante concilium Later erat hæreticum negare necessitatem confessionis, negantes tamen non erant hæretici. ratio est, quia nondum erat ab ecclesia declaratum.

Before the councell of Lateran it was hereticall to denie the necessity of confession, but yet they were not heretikes that denied it. The reason is, because the church of Rome had not yet declared it to be an article of faith.

Loe, these wordes conteine effectually, the exact proofe of this conclusion, if they be well marked.

We must therefore obserue first, that whosoeuer beleeueth not stedfastly euery decree of the church of Rome in matters of faith, is holden of that church for an heretike.

We must obserue secondly, that the councell of Lateran, (whereof this fryer speaketh) was holden in time of Pope Iulius the second, and pope Leo the tenth, that is 1500. yeares after Christ.

We must obserue thirdly, that vntill fifteene hundered yeares after Christ were expired, they that beleeued not popish auricular confession to be obtained by Christ, were no heretikes. For so, as you see, this fryer teacheth, and the Pope himselfe granteth.

ordained

We must obserue fourthly, that the church of Rome hath no authority, to coyne any new article of faith.

We must obserue fiftly, that the church of Rome hath no new reuelations in matters of faith, but the very same which it had in the Apostles time; both which latter obseruations, their own deare Canus telleth vs in these words:

Canus de loc. lib. 3. cap. 4.

Omnia si quidem fidei dogmata ab Apostolis accepit ecclesia, vel scripto, vel verbo, quoniam ij ministri fuere sermonis, nec vllas in fide nouas reuelationes ecclesia habet.

For the Church receiued all doctrines of faith from the Apostles, either by worde or writing. Because the Apostles were the ministers of the word, neither hath the church any new reuelations in faith.

Now out of these obseruations which are euident, it followeth necessarily, that confession this day ought not to be an article of faith, no not in the church of Rome.

For

For first, during the time of fifteen hundred yeares after Christ, it was no article of faith in the church of Rome.

Secondly, the church of Rome cannot make that an article of faith now, which was no article of faith in the Apostles time.

Thirdly the church of Rome hath no new reuelations, in matters of Christian faith. For so as you haue hearde, hath their owne Melchior Canus auouched.

Neither wil it help to say, that auricular confession was an article of faith in the apostles time, but not thē reuealed to the church. For as *Canus* told vs plainley, the church receiueth no new reuelations of faith.

This doctrin is confirmed by their famous Cardinal Caietā, who auoucheth two special grounds against popish auricular cōfession. For first, although Christ by his opinion instituted confession, yet did hee make it voluntarie, and left it in mans election, whether he wold confes, or not confes. Again, he telleth vs that the maner of popish confession, to wit, to confes secretly in the priestes eare, was not ordained by our Sauiour Christ. Out of which assertion, I infer a double conclusion against the Papists. The one, that confession is not necessary to saluation. For that which is voluntary, as to be a Monke, a Nun, a Priest, a Iesuite: is not necessary to saluation, as euery papist granteth: but is as a councel, and work of supererogation. The other, that popish law vrging men to auricular confession, is flat against Christs institution. And thus I weene, I haue proued this conclusion. *Caietan. super Ioan. cap. 20*

The 6. Conclusion.

IF popish confession were ordeined by Christ, as the Papists falsly & grosly imagine: yet would it follow by a necessary consecution, that euery Pope should be in danger of his saluation. This conclusion may seeme somewhat strange: but I prooue the same. By popish doctrine euery man and euery woman of lawfull yeares, are bound vnder paine of damnation, to the said confession; and consequently, the Pope being either man, or at least woman, (as is thought of Pope Iohn) is strictly bound vnto the same. Now sir, how our Pope his holines shal come to confession, and haue absolution of his sins, *hoc opus, hic labor est.* And that the reader may fully vnderstand the difficultie heerein: it is to be noted, that no priest can absolue any person from his sins, ouer whom he hath not superiority and iurisdiction: but, his holines hath both the swordes, his power is aboue Kings and Emperours, and ouer him no mortall creature, no not an *A*ngell of heauen, hath any iurisdiction

at all, as holdeth popiſh faith. The Pope then being ſubiect to none, and muſt yet be abſolued of ſome: which ſome, muſt haue iuriſdiction ouer him: ſtandeth doubtles in great perplexity, and in no ſmal danger of his ſaluation. Let vs therfore finde ſome pore ſhift, to help his holines if it may be. What if we ſay, that the Pope hath no mortal ſin, and ſo is not bound to popiſh abſolution. But allas, al popes are not ſaints, as is proued, and ſo ſome muſt perforce haue abſolutiõ. Let vs ſay, that he may abſolue himſelfe, as well as he may grant pardons to himſelfe. But alas, that implieth contradiction: becauſe ſo he remaining one and the ſame man, ſhould be both ſuperior and inferior to himſelfe: ſuperior, as he did abſolue: and inferior, as abſolued. Let vs ſay, that he voluntarily ſubmitteth himſelfe, and ſo receiueth abſolution. But alas, ſo ſhal his holines ſtill be inferior to the ſilly prieſt: becauſe as S. Paul diſcourſeth to the Hebrews, he that bleſſeth, is greater then he that is bleſſed. Let vs ſay, that the pope giueth to the prieſt power ouer him, for that time onely. But alas, that would be a rare and ſtrange metamorphoſis, with an impoſsibility annexed thereunto. For firſt, by this meanes the ſimple prieſt ſhould be pope in time of abſolution, as hauing then greteſt power vpon earth. Secondly, after abſolution, he that was pope, ſhould ceaſe to be pope: and he that was not pope, ſhould without election or conſecration be pope againe. Which is a thing impoſsible, euen by popiſh proceeding. Let vs ſay, that ſome other pope hath giuen this auctority to the prieſt. But alas, that cannot poſsibly be granted. For this is a conſtant axiome with the papiſts: *par in parem non habet poteſtatem.* When two are of equal auctority, the one cannot make a law for, or againſt the other. Wel, ſince none of theſe waies can contẽt his holines: let vs hear what his own dear vaſſals can ſay in his defenſe.

Hebru. 7,7

Argumentum ad hominum.

Ioſephus Angles vnfoldeth this great difficulty at large, when hee thus writeth:

Canus affert tres opiniones: prima eſt S. Thomæ, & D. Bonauenturæ, quibus adhæſit Turrecremata. Secunda opinione eſt Plaudani, aſſerentis habere authoritatem abſoluendi non à Papa, ſed à Chriſto. Tertia eſt Caietani, dicentis iuriſdictionem quam habet ſacerdos abſoluendi Papam, nec eſſe à Chriſto neque à Papa, neq; ab eccleſia, ſed ſolum ex electione, per hoc ſcilicet quod papa ſe ſubijcit illi illumq; eligit. Eſt & quarta opinio, qua tenetur, quod quemadmodum in receptione ordinis datur vnicuiq; ſimplici ſacerdoti poteſtas iuriſdictionis reſpectu venialis, & mortalis quæ pœnitens alias confeſſus eſt, & etiam reſpectu omniſcumq; peccatoris in articulo mortis: ita datur tunc iuriſdictio eidem ſacerdoti abſoluendi papam.

Ioſeph. Ang. in 4. ſ. q. de confeſ pag. 257.

Maſter

Maister Canus bringeth three opinions: the first is, of S. Thomas and S. Bonauenture, to whome agreeth Turrecremata. The second is, the opinion of Paludanus, who auoucheth that the Priest receiueth his authority not from the pope, but from Christ himselfe. The third opinion is Caietans, who affirmeth that the priest hath authority to absolue the Pope, neither from Christ, nor from the pope, nor from the Church, but only by election: to wit, in that the pope submiteth himselfe to the priest, and choseth him. And there is yet a fourth opinion, which holdeth that as in receiuing of priesthood, power of iurisdiction is giuen to euery simple priest, in respect of veniall sinnes, and of those mortals which the penitent hath otherwise confessed, and also in respect of euery sinner in the point of death: so is iurisdiction thē giuen to the said priest, that he may absolue the Pope.

Thus saith our reuerend Bishop, and woorthy fryer Ioseph. Out of whose words I note:

First, that since our Lord is the God of peace, and not of dissention, as recordeth his holy Apostle in many places: it must needes followe, that this Popish doctrine is not of God, which is so deuided against it selfe: and therefore said Caietan truely, though vnwittingly, and to another ende: when hee denied the Priest to haue his authority, from Christ, or from his Church. 1 Thess. 5, 23. 2 Thes. 3, 16. 1 Cor. 14, 33.

I note secondly, that their doctrine is meere opinatiue, as which is onely grounded vpon mans inuention.

I note thirdly, that as the priestes iurisdiction is vncertaine, so is the Popes absolution also, as which is consectary thereunto: and consequently, that the pope standeth in danger of his saluation. And so, if I be not deceiued, the obscurity of this conclusion is made euident.

THE COROLLARIE.

FIrst therefore, since auricular popish confession is not commanded by Christ: secondly, since it was not practised by the Apostles: thirdly, since it was instituted only by the positiue law of man: fourthly, since the Greeke Church neuer admitted that law: fifthly, since it is contrarie not only to the fathers, but to popish doctours also: sixtly, since it bringeth the pope himselfe to the hazard of his saluation.

I conclude, that it is a sufficient Motiue for me to renounce the Romish Religion, as false, erroneous and pernitious doctrine.

Thus much of the tenth and last Motiue.

Peroratio.

I Haue in this discourse (gentle Reader) briefly confuted ten special articles, of popish faith and religion.

First, I haue shewed the insufficiencie, blasphemie, and absurdities of popish pardons.

Secondly, that the Pope may both erre, and hath erred *de facto*, not onely as a priuat person in priuate opinion: but euen as pope and pub like person, in iudicial definitions.

Thirdly, that general counsels in these latters daies, are nothing els but a meer mockery and sophistical subtility, to deceiue Gods people withal. Fourthly, that the Popes dispensations are wicked, licentious, and intollerable.

Fiftly, that Kings are aboue Popes: that their power is independent: and that they are subiect to none, but to God alone.

Sixtly, that popish dissention is of matters most important, and incredible to such as are wel acquainted with their bookes.

Seuenthly, that the writings of the ancient fathers, are to be receiued with great reuerence: yet so, as we acknowledge them to be men, to haue their errours, and to binde vs to their authorities no further, then they accord with the holy Scriptures.

Eightly, that all things necessarie for our saluation, are conteined in the holy Scriptures; and that popish traditions are so vncerten, as the best learned papists cannot agree therein.

Ninthly, that after this life, there is neither merite, nor demerite, nor satisfaction to be made: and that the booke of *Machabees*, cannot establish Popish Purgatorie.

Tenthly, that the specificall enumeration and confession of all our sinnes: is not onely commaunded by the Scriptures, but repugnant to the same, and impossible to be accomplished by the power of man.

All

All which points I haue proued, not onely by ſcriptures authorities, and reaſons; but euen by the expreſſe teſtimonies, of beſt learned papiſts. A thing heretofore neuer performed by any, to my knowledge: & yet ſo forceable againſt the papiſts, (if I be not deceued,) as nothing can be more. My deſire was to content al, to offend none, to confirme the weak, to inſtruct the ignorant, to reclaim the ſeduced, and to confound all arrogant diſloyall ſubiects. If effect ſucceede correſpondent to my option, God be thanked for it, who is the chief worker of euery good act; to whom with the Sonne, and the Holy-ghoſt, three perſons and one God, be all honour, power, glorie, and dominion, now and euer. *Amen.*

FINIS.